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We acknowledge those who have been affected by domestic and family violence, including those who are currently, or have previously experienced, domestic and family violence. We solemnly acknowledge those individuals we have lost to domestic and family violence.

We thank those victim survivors who have shared their stories with us.
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# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEOC</td>
<td>Australia’s CEO Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANROWS</td>
<td>Australia’s National Research Organisation for Women’s Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARF</td>
<td>Curriculum, assessment and reporting framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Courts Innovation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJG</td>
<td>Community Justice Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATSIP</td>
<td>Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCDSS</td>
<td>Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSYW</td>
<td>Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAT</td>
<td>Disability and Elder Abuse Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council</td>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVPM</td>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHPW</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Department of the Premier and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO</td>
<td>Fly-in, fly-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Hospital and Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRT</td>
<td>High Risk Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICJ</td>
<td>Integrated Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>Interdepartmental CEO Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>Integrated Service Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSR</td>
<td>Institute of Social Science Research (The University of Queensland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWSITH</td>
<td>Keeping Women Safe in their Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTIQ</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex or queer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>Left hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>Personal Duress Alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Public Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCS</td>
<td>Queensland Corrective Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Queensland Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QHIP</td>
<td>Queensland Homelessness Information Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPP</td>
<td>Queensland Procurement Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Queensland Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS</td>
<td>Queensland Social Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Queensland Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHS</td>
<td>Right hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE</td>
<td>Respectful Relationships Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RREP</td>
<td>Respectful Relationships Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRR</td>
<td>Recognise, Respond, Refer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>South East Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYCADFV</td>
<td>Support for Young Children Affected by Domestic and Family Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WfQ</td>
<td>Working for Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGEA</td>
<td>Workplace Gender Equality Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRA</td>
<td>White Ribbon Accreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis accommodation</td>
<td>The crisis accommodation program funds providers to help eligible people (those who are homeless, in crisis, at risk of homelessness, or in need of support to transition to independent living) find accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funded perpetrator program responses</td>
<td>Programs that are delivered to perpetrators of domestic and family violence that are government-funded and are aimed at changing perpetrator behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-owned and managed social rental housing</td>
<td>Government-managed social rental housing comprises both the public rental housing program and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing rental program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Watch pilot</td>
<td>In 2017, DoE partnered with Our Watch to pilot a whole-school approach to RRE in 10 Queensland state primary schools. It involves professional development for staff, auditing current policies and processes, engaging parents to reinforce messages regarding respect and equality received at school. Ten hours of curriculum instruction, for students in Years 1 and 2, has also been implemented and is currently being evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator interventions</td>
<td>Refers to a range of interventions that seek to hold perpetrators to account and take responsibility for their behaviour. This includes perpetrator programs aimed at changing behaviour delivered by corrections and the community sector and broader system supports such as court, corrections and police responses that work to hold perpetrators to account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant relationship</td>
<td>Defined in the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld) as one which falls within one of the three categories, either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) An intimate personal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) A family relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) An information care relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful relationships education (RRE)</td>
<td>A broad term to describe a holistic approach to the primary prevention of domestic and family violence and gender-based violence. RRE focuses specifically on preventing the underlying drivers of domestic and family violence and gender-based violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful relationships education program (RREP)</td>
<td>In 2016, the DoE developed the RREP in response to the DFV Taskforce report and recommendations. The RREP is a Prep to Year 12 program aligned to the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (HPE). It is available to all Queensland schools via appropriate online platforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service integration</td>
<td>The extent of service connection in integrated response varies, ranging from those with loose networks of interagency meetings, through streamlined referral systems, to tightly-woven response systems explicitly accountable to both clients and one another through formal agreements (Wilcox 2010, Healey, Humphreys et al. 2013). Whilst the terms used to describe service systems involved in multi-agency responses, such as “integrated” “coordinated” and “collaborative” are often used arbitrarily and interchangeably, in practice, the models can be distinguished in relation to the extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to which they sacrifice organisational autonomy for case-focused unity (Wilcox 2010, reproduced from Breckenridge et al., 2015, p 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social housing</th>
<th>Comprises Social Rental Housing plus Crisis Accommodation Program and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Local Government communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social rental housing</td>
<td>Programs include Public Rental Housing, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing Rental Program, Community Rent Scheme, Same House Different Landlord, Long Term Community Housing Program, Community-managed Housing-Studio Units, Affordable Housing Program and Supportive Housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>Social housing tenants may transfer between and within community and public housing based on assessed need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable population groups</td>
<td>The term vulnerable population group is used to refer to those particular groups identified by The Taskforce as disproportionately more likely to experience domestic and family violence or that they face additional barriers when experiencing domestic and family violence. The Not Now, Not Ever: Putting an End to Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland report identifies these population groups as: “Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, the elderly, people with a disability, people in rural and remote communities, people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex, and children are all at significantly higher risk from the incidences and impacts of domestic and family violence”. It is important to recognise that this specifically relates to the likelihood of experiencing domestic and family violence and additional barriers that may be faced when experiencing domestic and family violence. Terminology to refer to these population groups is consistent with the Not Now, Not Ever: Putting an End to Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland report. An exception to this is the use of the term ‘older person’ instead of ‘the elderly’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A note on terminology

In this report we use the term domestic and family violence to describe those behaviours outlined in the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act (2012)*, Division 2, Section 8.

Deloitte Access Economics recognises the terms to describe someone who has been, or is affected by, domestic and family violence and someone who uses domestic and family violence are contested. There are many reasons that drive these different preferences, including ensuring it is appropriate for different characteristics of those who are using or experiencing violence.

In this report, we use the term 'victim survivor' to describe those who are or have been affected by domestic and family violence. This recognises that individuals who have experienced, or are or have been affected by domestic and family violence may have a preference for one of these terms, or both.

We also use the term 'perpetrator' to describe those who have or are currently using domestic and family violence.

As identified in the glossary, the term vulnerable population group is used to refer to those particular groups identified by The Taskforce as being more vulnerable and at risk of being abused in a domestic or family violence situation than others in the community.
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Executive summary

Introduction

Background

Deloitte Access Economics in partnership with Ipsos has been engaged by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) to support implementation of the evaluation framework for the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2016-2026) (the Strategy).

The Strategy arose from the Queensland Government and special taskforce on domestic and family violence, which produced 140 recommendations in its report titled 'Not Now, Not Ever: Putting an End to Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland (2015) (the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report). The Strategy is an ambitious and complex reform involving 14 implementing government agencies¹ and supported by a $328.9 million investment over six years. The Strategy comprises seven supporting outcomes across three foundational elements, as shown in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1. Overview of Strategy

Vision: A Queensland free from domestic and family violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational elements</th>
<th>Supporting Outcomes (SO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>SO1: Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 An integrated response system that delivers the services and support that victims and perpetrators need</td>
<td>SO2: Respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour are embedded in our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account</td>
<td>SO3: Queensland community, business, religious sporting and all government leaders are taking action and working together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO4: Queensland’s workplaces and workforce challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO5: Victims and their families are safe and supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO6: Perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO7: The justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initiatives of the Strategy will be delivered through a series of four action plans to maintain flexibility around service delivery, as well as to adapt to, and build on achievements and lessons from prior action plans.

The First Action Plan was implemented in 2015. The Second Action Plan 2016–17 to 2018–19 has the overarching goal to transform the way in which the Queensland society works together to better protect victim survivors and hold perpetrators to account.² The Queensland Government’s investment to implement recommendations from the Not Now, Not Ever Report is $328.9 million over six years from 2015-16.

¹ These agencies include Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Queensland Treasury, Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women, Public Service Commission, Queensland Police Service, Department of Education, Department of Health, Department of Housing and Public Works, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors, Queensland Corrective Services, Department of Employment, Small Business and Training, Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs.

Underpinning the entire Strategy is a comprehensive evaluation framework that guides evaluation activities throughout the life of the Strategy. The evaluation framework comprises four evaluation components:

- **Process evaluation** to understand the implementation of the Strategy
- **Flagship evaluations** to understand the effectiveness of key signature initiatives of the Strategy
- **Outcomes evaluation** to develop an understanding of progress against key core outcomes at an interim and review phase, and
- **Capability building** of the implementing agencies evaluation skills, to enable evaluation activities to be embedded throughout implementation of the Strategy.

The evaluation framework involves a number of reporting mechanisms that enhance and support performance management, oversight and review of the Strategy, which include:

- **Annual Scorecards** – allow for interim monitoring of outcomes of the Strategy over the course of the Strategy
- **Action Plan Review** – a comprehensive evaluation that is conducted towards the end of each Action Plan’s implementation phase to allow for a review of the processes and outcomes to inform future Action Plan development and implementation
- **Structured Review** – a review of the activities that are being implemented in each Action Plan to understand how they are progressing to achieving the stated objective.

This report

The evaluation framework for the Strategy includes a structured review of the Second Action Plan. The purpose of the structured review is to summarise progress to date and develop a single narrative describing the extent to which the action plan has progressed the reform towards its key outcome.

This report is the final report for the structured review of the Second Action Plan. The purpose of this report is to provide a description of progress to date, and learnings for the Third Action Plan.

The data collection activities that have informed this report are shown in Table 1.1. A document review was also conducted and included Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council (DFVI Council) and agency updates, and closure reports.

### Table 1.1 Evaluation data collection activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Number undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured focus group with members of the DFVI Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured focus group with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with members of the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies on specific actions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim survivor open conversation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected against the evaluation framework indicator matrix</td>
<td>6 participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional consultations with implementing agencies</td>
<td>6 focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey with service providers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey with implementing agency staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress to date

The delivery and implementation of the actions within the Second Action Plan by implementing agencies to date is commendable

Overall, the 14 implementing agencies have delivered 61 actions within the Second Action Plan and commenced the remaining 23. Given the scale and complexity of the reforms undertaken, this delivery and implementation to date is commendable, a sentiment echoed during consultations with stakeholders both internal and external to government. This includes delivering or commencing 14 enabling actions, 55 initiatives, six pilots and nine legislative related actions. This has included:

- **Increasing knowledge of domestic violence** – through the delivery of a communications and engagement strategy comprising six campaigns and other awareness raising events.
- **Influencing attitudes** – through workplace initiatives (e.g. more than 12,349 public sector employees participating in online domestic and family violence training between 7 July 2017 and 23 November 2018), White Ribbon Accreditation (WRA) (e.g. an increase from 3 to 19 government agencies completing the WRA program between 2016 and 2018) and implementing respectful relationships education (RRE). As of May 2019, all Queensland Government departments are WRA accredited workplaces.
- **System and service enhancements** – including through the establishment of Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Courts, High Risk Teams (HRTs) and integrated service responses (ISR), training and support to frontline staff, legislative change, and publication of toolkits and resources to guide service delivery.

In addition to government agencies delivering actions, there are examples of the business sector, service sector and communities championing the domestic and family violence reforms locally. Throughout the consultations and documents reviewed, there were numerous examples of people working to implement the foundational elements of the Strategy locally within their community. Examples were observed across a range of sectors, including schools, businesses, health services, and local councils. A theme emerging from these examples was the concept of **place-based** approaches to respond to local need. For example, in Mackay the Regional Council has established a Domestic Violence Taskforce that brings together representatives across business, domestic and family violence services, schools and the local council to design and deliver a local community response to addressing domestic and family violence. The Queensland Social Survey (QSS), reports that in 2018, approximately 7.6% of the population were involved in domestic and family violence initiatives in their community, (down slightly from 9.2% the previous year). Progress is also being made in private sector organisations. There was a six percentage point increase in the proportion of Queensland-based non-government organisations reporting to the Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA) as having a formalised workplace domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy between 2016–17 to 2017–18. Progress appears to be concentrated in larger, well-resourced organisations.

It is too early to observe the long-term outcomes sought from the Strategy, though there are examples of programs, including pilots, which are showing promising results, suggesting that Queensland is on track to achieve its objectives. Overall, as the Second Action Plan represents year one through to three of a 10-year Strategy, it is too early to see realisation of the seven supporting outcomes that underpin the Strategy, which is expected. This is because the supporting outcomes describe significant systemic and cultural changes to the approach taken in Queensland to respond to, and prevent, domestic and family violence.
Foundational element one: A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours

Changing behaviours takes time, and requires changes in knowledge and then attitudes. A range of initiatives have been undertaken within and by organisations to increase understanding and knowledge of domestic and family violence and start to challenge attitudes.

Schools, workplaces and communities continue to play an important role in raising understanding of domestic and family violence, and challenging and changing attitudes. Respectful Relationships Education (RRE) sets the foundation for this, with a pending flagship evaluation reporting on early outcomes of the Our Watch pilot. A case study focussed on respectful relationships education identified that leadership and dedicated support for implementation are essential to embedding respectful relationships and growing staff capability. Based on data collated by the Department of Education (DoE) from the 2018 School Annual Reports, the vast majority of Queensland state schools reported to have implemented RRE\(^3\). In the context of the school community, delivery of respectful relationships education draws from a variety of resources, one of which is the department’s Respectful Relationships Education Program (RREP) which is focussed specifically on influencing behaviour change in an effort to prevent issues such as domestic and family violence. Other resources or programs available to schools in implementing respectful relationships education may also encompass components that challenge attitudes about violence and gender construction known to lead to violence, alongside components addressing a broader range of complex social and emotional issues relevant to children and young people such as mental health, personal safety and protective behaviours. In 2017, 59% of the schools who reported delivering RRE also reported this included RREP, demonstrating this is an important resource that schools across Queensland rely upon as part of their RRE. There had been a reported increase in uptake of the DoE’s RREP between 2017 and 2018. The Queensland Government also embarked on a communications and engagement strategy, to increase knowledge of domestic and family violence in the community, including where to go for help.

There are examples of communities working together to achieve the outcomes under foundational element one. Approximately 7.6% of Queenslanders report being involved in domestic and family violence prevention activities in 2018. Mechanisms through which organisations are sharing knowledge include through place-based approaches, co-design, embedded officers, formal arrangements and partnerships, and informal arrangements and networks.

Workplaces too are working to provide domestic and family violence policies and support. Supporting outcome four is an area where we are starting to see early signs of success from the delivery of training and WRA activities. Between 2017 and 2018 there was a six percentage point statistically significant increase in the average proportion of employees within government agencies who reported that they were aware of domestic and family violence support policies. The proportion of employees who were aware of government policies was higher among those employed at White Ribbon Accredited Workplaces – 81% in 2017 for those with WRA compared to 74% for non-accredited workplaces.\(^4\) All government departments are now WRA accredited.

At a population level, there have been no statistically significant shifts in community knowledge and attitudes towards domestic and family violence, noting Queensland has started from a high base. Specifically, according to the indicators relied upon to track progress under the reforms:

- In 2018, up to 93% of Queenslanders recognised six defined behaviours as forms of domestic and family violence, and up to 90% of Queenslanders believed these behaviours to be serious
- More than 76% of Queenslanders value the importance of a ‘culture that respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’, there has been a decline in the response rates for ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ from 2017 to 2018.

Findings suggest there may need to be a focus on increasing knowledge of non-physical forms of domestic and family violence, such as technology facilitated abuse, financial control and verbal and

\(^3\) Note that the method of collecting data on uptake of RRE and RREP in 2017 was different to 2018, and therefore any comparison should be interpreted with caution.

psychological abuse, and their seriousness. More could be done to increase understanding that gender equality is a driver for domestic and family violence, and to start challenging attitudes.

Foundational element two: Integrating service responses

Service providers are generally positive in terms of the contribution of the domestic and family violence reforms toward a range of service system indicators for victim survivors, including access to and uptake of services. Demand for crisis and post-crisis support remains high:

- There is evidence of increased demand for certain services, including brokerage funding\(^5\), social rental housing, bond loans and rental grants.
- Referrals to crisis accommodation has remained high and stable from 2015–16 to 2017–18. It is unclear what is driving this change – this could represent increases in awareness of services or willingness and ability to report domestic and family violence.
- The number of transfers and time for a transfer has increased. The data indicates that the length of time for a transfer to occur has increased from a median of 2.6 months in 2015–16 to 4.3 months in 2017–18.
- The number of SHS clients citing domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking SHS assistance increased from 7,151 in 2015–16 to 8,002 in 2017–18. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are over-represented in SHS clients.

There is however a need to ensure feelings of safety are improved. Service providers, through the Service Provider Survey, noted more could be done to ensure existing support translate into improved feelings of safety for victim survivors, including that there are sufficient and flexible resources to ensure this demand can be met. Provision of flexible funding support to support longer-term recovery, including for housing responses, is worthy of future consideration.

Stories from victim survivors themselves demonstrate a diversity of experiences, however for some there is clearly more that can be done to ensure the service system is responsive to their needs. People with lived experience of domestic and family violence reported that there are opportunities to improve promotion of existing services to increase their visibility and accessibility; strengthen integrated responses through an understanding of user system journeys. This will also require a focused response to the needs of diverse population groups.

Foundational element three: Strengthening justice system

Accountability can be interpreted from two perspectives:

1. Systems and policies such as court and policing responses holding a perpetrator accountable through perpetrator interventions
2. Perpetrators themselves understanding the impact of their offending behaviour, taking responsibility, and changing their behaviour, e.g. Government-funded perpetrator programs focus on changing perpetrator attitudes and behaviour.

While it is too early to tell if the outcomes sought from improvements to the justice system have been achieved, there have been positive early indicators of improved victim experiences from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court and use of the online DV1 form. The Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court evaluation suggests progress is being made. It found that 45% of victim survivor participants agreed or strongly agreed that the perpetrator was held responsible for their behaviour by the Magistrate, compared to 39% in the comparison court. Those working at the court felt the specialist nature contributed to holding perpetrators to account. This is an example of progress toward supporting outcome six – perpetrators are held to account, noting this specifically relates to the court system holding them to account.

---

\(^5\) There is no specific definition of brokerage under the National Classification of Community Services. Here, it is defined as the purchase of a good/service that will support client(s) to meet their goals as specified in a case/support plan (DHPW. (2018). Guidelines for the use of Brokerage Funds in Specialist Homelessness Services. Accessed on 08 May 2019 via http://www.hpw.qld.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/brokerage-guidelines-for-shs.pdf).
There are other indications that the justice system is responding to meet the needs of victim survivors and perpetrators. Legislative changes have been implemented, including non-lethal strangulation becoming a standalone offence in Queensland in 2016. Available data points to the improvement in the policing, prosecuting and support systems of domestic and family violence; DVO breaches, intervention orders and referrals from police have all increased.

However from the perspective of perpetrators themselves taking responsibility for their actions, more may need to be done. Only 50% of services agreed that the reforms have contributed to an increase in access to and uptake of services by perpetrators.

Gaps in progress
There have been an insufficient breadth and depth of actions to ensure equitable progress to meet the needs of diverse population groups. The Second Action Plan comprises 84 actions of which 18 relate to diverse population groups, including people from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people with disability, older people and those residing in regional and remote areas. These include five actions under foundational element one, six actions under foundational element two and seven actions under foundational element three. Of note, no diverse population groups have actions that span across all foundational elements, which underpins the variability in focus across these populations.

For some population groups including older people, people with disability and people who identify as LGBTQIQ, focus has been on increasing knowledge and understanding, including conducting reviews to increase understanding of the prevalence of domestic and family violence experienced by diverse populations and undertaking communications campaigns targeted at these population groups to raise awareness of the issue.

Qualitative data from consultations and surveys suggests more can be done to meet the needs of diverse population groups. One particular issue raised was the lack of capability within general domestic and family violence services to cater to the needs of these population groups. This was raised about people with disability and by CALD service providers who reported they were inundated with referrals from general services and commented on the gaps in capability building and support across the domestic and family violence sector.

For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, there was a common view among a range of stakeholders consulted that responses have not been culturally appropriate and that responding to domestic and family violence needs to be Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led, designed and owned. Adapting existing programs may not be appropriate, as responses for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people need to be considered in the context of historic systemic violence directed toward them.6

The focus to date appears to have been on the justice system holding perpetrators to account, with gaps in progress regarding perpetrators taking responsibility to reduce or stop their behaviour. To date, there have been numerous initiatives, as previously discussed, that have contributed to the justice system holding perpetrators to account. However in terms of programs that work to educate perpetrators as to why and how to change their behaviour, and thus ultimately improve victim survivor safety, further work is warranted. Of the 15 actions related to supporting outcome six – holding perpetrators to account – only three are linked exclusively to this outcome, while the remainder are also linked to supporting outcome seven relating to the justice system. This suggests there is a gap in focus on perpetrators changing their behaviour in the Second Action Plan. This is mirrored in the Service Provider Survey. Only 50% of services who responded to the Service Provider Survey7 (2019) agreed that the reforms have contributed to an increase in

---

6 In May 2019, the Queensland Government released the 'Queensland’s Framework for Action – Reshaping our approach to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander domestic and family violence'. This is the State Government’s response to Recommendation 20 of the Death Review and Advisory Board’s 2016–17 Annual Report regarding the development of a specific Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Family Violence Strategy as a matter of urgent priority.

7 The Service Provider Survey 2019 was designed and fielded by Deloitte Access Economics. The aim of the survey was to understand the views of service providers on the impacts of the Second Action Plan on its
access to and uptake of services by perpetrators. The median response was disagreement that victim survivors are confident in the success of perpetrator interventions, mirroring results from the second Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court evaluation (undertaken by Griffith University), in which only one quarter of victim survivors reportedly agreed that perpetrators had taken responsibility for their behaviour. This may reflect why service providers reported lower levels of agreement that victim survivors feel safe.

In some instances, there is currently **insufficient data to be able to monitor progress on outcomes**, for example with perpetrator interventions.

**Enablers**

Leadership, engagement, innovation, place-based approaches and collaboration were identified as important enablers of implementation, which also drive outcomes under the three foundational elements.

Cited by a range of stakeholders, as well as documented in various flagship evaluations, **strong leadership and ownership of the issue and the solution is a common element in the success of the Second Action Plan to date.** Importantly, leadership as an enabler of implementation occurs across different levels – from people championing particular activities to prevent domestic and family violence in communities, through to Ministerial leadership.

A number of agency representatives from the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group highlighted the emphasis placed on addressing domestic and family violence by the Queensland Premier, Hon Annastacia Palaszczuk. This has reportedly created a mandate for Ministers and Directors General to prioritise the recommendations and actions set out in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report and Second Action Plan.

In addition to top-down leadership, there are also examples where local leadership has been cited as an important mechanism for prioritising action, creating buy-in and followship within the communities they live and work, and driving the outcomes sought under the Second Action Plan. For example, school principals have been essential in implementing and embedding RRE, while the Mackay Regional Council has also prioritised and driven change in their community through the establishment of a local domestic and family violence Taskforce. The Mackay case study provided insights into how leaders can be encouraged to drive responses to domestic and family violence. This included having a recognised leader (in the example Quentin Bryce and Rosie Batty), raise the profile of domestic and family violence and making the topic relevant to leaders through personalised stories or using local data.

**Collaboration has also been cited as an enabler of effective implementation of actions and as an enabler for changing knowledge, attitude and behaviour.** The mechanism through which collaboration occurs varies. At the service system level, the concept of an embedded officer was frequently raised, including examples of a domestic and family violence worker located at a hospital and within domestic and family violence taskforces led by the Queensland Police Service (QPS). This form of collaboration has increased knowledge of identifying and responding to people with disability experiencing domestic and family violence and elder abuse. The officer has also aided the networks between service providers and implementing agencies, increasing mutual trust and knowledge. In this way, embedded officers have helped to improve responses to people experiencing domestic and family violence who come to the attention of the health system, as well as increased knowledge among police in identifying and responding to people with disability or older Queenslanders experiencing domestic and family violence. Embedded officers have also helped to grow local networks and build referral pathways between service providers and implementing agencies, and increase mutual trust between partners to facilitate information sharing.

**Engagement with the reforms also appears to be driving progress.** Results from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) show that, overall, Queensland Government agency staff appear to be engaged with the implementation of the Second Action Plan. More than 50% of survey provision of services and outcomes of victim survivors and perpetrators. The survey was distributed to service providers across Queensland with a contract with the Queensland Government.
respondents strongly agreed (a score of 10) that their agency was committed to implementing the prevention strategy.

**Innovative approaches and flexibility to implement actions also appear to be important enablers of implementation.** Evidence of this has been demonstrated in some of the case studies and pilots. The DJAG case study describes the online DV1 forms, the first of its kind. DCSYW has also initiated innovation workshops to identify solutions to address waitlists for perpetrator programs.

**Barriers**

At times there has been a focus on compliance rather than the outcomes that the actions are seeking to achieve. This was evident in the manner in which those interviewed spoke about the actions in terms of whether they were ‘done’, or whether they engaged more in discussing the purpose and outcomes of the actions, including extending timeframes or adapting the design of an action to ensure the focus was on the intended results. Some stakeholders indicated that onerous reporting may have contributed to this compliance mindset.

Prioritising reform activities is a barrier contributed to by a lack of buy-in from senior leaders. There are examples where senior leaders have not been as committed to the Second Action Plan, limiting progress. This is not to say domestic and family violence was not seen as important, but rather, it was seen as one of many priority areas for agencies to deliver. This challenge of buy-in also had the potential to flow through to the service level. For example, it was noted in the DoE case study consultations that schools face a busy curriculum landscape which may prevent uptake of additional initiatives, while the Queensland Health (QH) case study also discussed the challenges associated with finding an appropriate balance between training and other obligations including clinical work.

Operationalising information sharing legislation, including changing ways of working to support implementation of the legislation, was cited as a barrier by a number of stakeholders seeking to implement integrated and coordinated responses. Some of this was attributed to organisational barriers, including cultural barriers associated with not sharing information. Other interview participants discussed organisational risk adversity as a barrier to information sharing, suggesting that, particularly in the community sector, some agencies may not share information as well as they could due to the fear of litigation.

Other barriers that were raised included the availability of appropriately skilled workers to deliver actions related to the reforms. For example, some stakeholders noted that staffing was a challenge with implementation due to the nature of structural changes, and specialised and challenging work. This was exacerbated when it related to workforce with additional expertise in working with diverse population groups, and also those in regional areas.

A final barrier to the implementation of the Strategy is the allocation of sufficient funding/resources to enable agencies and service providers to implement programs and actions effectively. Findings from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) identified that 39% of survey respondents viewed the insufficient allocation of resources as a key barrier to the implementation of their actions.
Future focus
Greater focus should be placed on meeting the needs of diverse population groups, and ensuring equitable achievement of the outcomes within the Strategy. This includes a mix of specialised support and building capability among general domestic and family violence services. Stakeholders from implementing agencies and specialist providers agreed on the necessity to embed capacity building into existing domestic and family violence service provision as a way to upskill the broader sector in working with those diverse clients. This includes those groups identified by the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report as being more vulnerable and at risk of being abused in a domestic or family violence situation, specifically Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people with disability, people from CALD backgrounds, people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex or queer (LGBTIQ) and older people. Some service providers also noted the importance of recognising diversity within diversity, and that for some population groups specialist services can bring a deeper knowledge and understanding of the unique challenges faced by particular cohorts. This applies to both victim survivors and perpetrators of domestic and family violence. Some steps have been taken, with the Queensland Government releasing a plan to respond to domestic and family violence against people with disability in 2019.

Future actions for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people should be designed and led by their own community, to contribute to better outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Stakeholders emphasised this point, recognising that:

"The term ‘family violence’ is commonly used when referring to violence that occurs within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families and communities. This concept places a greater emphasis on the impact on the family as a whole and contextualises this type of violence more broadly, recognising the impact of dispossession, breakdown of kinship networks, child removal policies and entrenched disadvantage, as well as intergenerational trauma and grief on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families and communities…Although responding to individual needs is a fundamental requirement of all service responses, in circumstances where one or both clients identifies as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, extra consideration regarding how best to respond in a way that appropriately accounts for this, is required. This requires flexibility and an ability to adapt culturally specific and mainstream approaches in a holistic way."8

For example, mainstream domestic and family violence service providers may not be sufficiently culturally competent to effectively respond to the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This can contribute to poorer outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and/or a lack of engagement with services. Stakeholders reflected the importance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people leading domestic and family violence responses in their community to ensure cultural appropriateness and local ownership.

To achieve real improvements for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, it is important that future actions recognise their unique experience of domestic and family violence, and ensure Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are directly involved in the design, implementation and operation of domestic and family violence reforms. It is also important to build cultural competency across the domestic and family violence service sector to ensure mainstream services are equipped to appropriately recognise and respond to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who experience domestic and family violence. Implementing ‘Queensland’s Framework for Action – Reshaping our approach to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander domestic and family violence’ is the first step towards achieving equity across the reform program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

---

More may need to be done to ensure perpetrators stop using violence to improve victim survivor safety. Learning more about the services provided to perpetrators to ensure they too are taking responsibility for their behaviour is required. This will need to include developing an evidence base on how effective these programs are, with a focus on outcomes that are being realised through robust data collection. Understanding whether the current perpetrator response is appropriately resourced, in terms of the type and number of perpetrator programs available, will assist.

There may need to be a focus on increasing knowledge of non-physical types and seriousness of domestic and family violence, including psychological abuse, technology-facilitated abuse and financial abuse. While there have been communications campaigns focused on providing explanations of financial, emotional and psychologic abuse, there remain lower levels of understanding that these behaviours constitute domestic and family violence relative to other forms of domestic and family violence. This would serve to address gaps in the Queensland community’s knowledge that these behaviours constitute domestic and family violence, and their seriousness. In this way increased awareness raising is targeted in its approach.

Further work is needed to challenge those attitudes known to contribute to the social conditions that facilitate domestic and family violence. There is still more work to be done to challenge attitudes related to gender equality – the main driver of domestic and family violence. The QSS shows 76% of Queenslanders strongly agree or agree with the statement: ‘it is important our culture respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’. While only 9% of the Queensland population disagree or strongly disagree with this statement, the estimated proportion of Queenslanders that agree or strongly agree has statistically significantly declined. This demonstrates scope for further improvement. Cultural change takes times. It will be important for the changes achieved to date to be sustained, and for the reforms to continue to progress towards their overarching goals under future Action Plans. This is particularly important if we are to challenge attitudes and change behaviours that perpetuate domestic and family violence.

As the Strategy moves forward, consideration should also be given to ensuring a strategic and outcomes-driven approach is adopted, rather than compliance. Ensuring governance is focused on leadership and creating buy-in among senior leaders of agencies could be a mechanism for facilitating this process. It is important that the governance structure facilitates agile approaches to implementation (as opposed to rigid, compliance based reporting), particularly where flexibility is likely to better achieve the outcomes sought under the domestic and family violence reforms. Ensuring data is being collected across all of the supporting outcomes to assist in monitoring progress of and outcomes in, the Strategy will also be important.

Moving beyond pilots and focusing investment in areas known to work. This includes finding efficient means of scaling pilots where flagship or other evaluations find them to be effective. There are a number of evaluations planned, under way or completed, including for the Keeping Women Safe in their Homes and Our Watch pilot, which will provide useful starting points to understand whether these programs are effective and if so, and opportunities for scaling them. Ensuring these are adapted as required to meet the contextual setting will be critical. This will enable learnings to be scaled up and out to enable outcomes to be realised across the State.

Consideration will need to be given regarding how to leverage local leadership to empower community and business initiatives. Empowering business and community leaders, including in how to embed place-based approaches, may assist in building community ownership. It will be important to do this strategically to overcome selection bias – where areas with the greatest need may go unmet if there is a lack of strong leadership and engagement.

Deloitte Access Economics
**Executive Summary**

The Second Action Plan under the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (the Strategy), covering the period from July 2016 to June 2019, has the overarching goal to transform the way in which Queensland society works together to better protect victims and hold perpetrators to account. An overview of implementation progress under the Second Action Plan, including barriers to and enablers of implementation, are presented below. An overview of progress against the seven supporting outcomes of the Strategy is presented overleaf.

---

**Overall delivery of the Second Action Plan**

- 23 actions commenced
- 61 actions delivered

**Number of actions by type of action**

Activity under the Second Action Plan was broadly concerned with implementing the Queensland Government’s response to recommendations made in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. Actions reflect an array of initiatives, programs, pilots and legislative amendments consistent with these recommendations.

---

**Foundational Element 1: A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours**

Of the 84 actions within the Second Action Plan, 35 fall under foundational element one. 34 of the 35 actions have been delivered. These actions have been delivered through:

- Combination of broad awareness-raising activities using mass communication channels
- Reforms that build domestic and family violence prevention capability into key institutions (e.g. workplaces, schools and community organisations)

**Foundational Element 2: An integrated response system that delivers the services and support that victims and perpetrators need**

Of the 84 actions within the Second Action Plan, 22 fall under foundational element two. 15 of the 22 actions have been delivered. Examples of the type of actions implemented in this foundational element are integrated service response trials, new or enhanced domestic and family violence specialist services, and domestic and family violence relevant resources and training for hospital and emergency departments.

**Foundational Element 3: A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account**

Of the 84 actions within the Second Action Plan, 27 fall under foundational element three. 12 of the 27 actions have been delivered. Foundational work has occurred to hold perpetrators to account and strengthen justice system responses including: commencement of a review of practice standards, roll-out of men’s behaviour change programs, implementation of specialist domestic and family violence courts, and work to improve policing responses to people experiencing domestic and family violence.

---

**What are the enablers and barriers to the effective implementation of the Second Action Plan?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enablers</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td><strong>Inconsistent information sharing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td><strong>Compliance focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td><strong>Funding and resource allocation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation of reform activities</td>
<td><strong>Compliance focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce capability and capacity</td>
<td><strong>Inconsistent information sharing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**How effective have the governance arrangements been for delivering the Second Action Plan?**

- **Enablers**
  - Leadership: presence of the reforms being led by the Premier and Minister has been cited as an effective feature of the governance arrangements, signalling the importance of the Strategy and overall implementation of the Second Action Plan.
  - DFVI Council: considered to be an effective mechanism for ensuring oversight and accountability, independent of government.
  - Mechanisms for a more collaborative approach: agencies were responsible not only to their Ministers, but also each other.

- **Barriers**
  - Compliance and red tape such as the reporting requirements have been reported as impediments to efficient governance. It was noted that at times these can be excessive, diluting the focus on delivery and outcomes.
Executive Summary

Foundational Element 1: A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours

SO1: Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence

- Knowledge: 93% of Queenslanders understand and defined all six types of DFV
- Levels of knowledge of what behaviour constitutes DFV remained sustained over 2017 and 2018
- Need for a targeted approach to increase knowledge of non-physical types and seriousness of domestic and family violence

Foundational Element 2: An integrated response system that delivers the services and support that victims and perpetrators need

SO2: Respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour are embedded in our community

In 2018, 368 of 1,240 Queensland state schools reported they were implementing DoE’s Respectful Relationships Education Program.

Cultural change is expected to take time

It is too early to tell whether cultural change has occurred. Initiatives have focused on increasing knowledge of the behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence and awareness of services available.

SO3: Queensland community, business religious sporting and all government leaders are taking action and working together

- 7.6% of Queenslanders are involved in domestic and family violence prevention initiatives
- Leadership is a key enabler to ensure that communities are owning the issue
- Better engage the private sector and community to work together

Foundational Element 3: A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account

SO4: Queensland’s workplaces and workforce challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers

Between 2017 and 2018 there was a 6 percentage point statistically significant increase in the proportion of employees at government agencies who reported that they were aware of DFV support policies.

All Queensland Government departments are accredited White Ribbon Accredited workplaces as of May 2019.

In 2017, the proportion of employees who were aware of government policies was higher among those employed at White Ribbon Accredited workplaces.

SO5: Victims and their families are safe and supported

- Survey for service providers (n=26) indicated general positivity in terms of the contribution of the DFV reforms toward services for victims
- Need to ensure this translates into improved feeling of safety for victims

Victim survivor: “I came to Australia because it’s a safe country. When I tried to seek help I was told I didn’t have enough evidence.”

Foundational element 3: A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account.

SO6: Perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account

A greater focus on behaviour-change responses

Queensland police have attended 3.2% more domestic and family violence matters, and made more than double the amount of referrals for perpetrators than in 2015-16.

Queensland courts made 1,080 intervention orders in 2017-18, 39% of which were through the domestic and family violence specialist court in Southport.

2 in 3 victim survivors are satisfied with Police services regarding a DOV breach, but one in four remain dissatisfied.

Less than 50% of service providers surveyed agreed that the reforms have contributed to behaviour change among perpetrators.

SO7: The justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence

Real outcomes of justice system responses likely won’t be evident for a number of years.

In 2018:
- 90% of Magistrate’s court registry staff members had received professional development
- 32 of the 39 magistrate courts that participated in monthly DFV stakeholder meetings

* In 2018, the vast majority of Queensland state schools reported to have implemented Respectful Relationships Education (RRE). Delivery of RRE draws from a variety of resources, one of which is the department’s Respectful Relationships Education Program (RREP) which is focused specifically on influencing behaviour change in an effort to prevent issues such as domestic and family violence. Other resources or programs available to schools in implementing RRE may also encompass components that challenge attitudes about violence and gender construction known to lead to violence, alongside components addressing a broader range of complex social and emotional issues relevant to children and young people.
1 Introduction

1.1 Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy

1.1.1 The Taskforce and the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy

The Queensland Government and Premier established a special taskforce on domestic and family violence (The Taskforce) in 2014. The Taskforce delivered a report titled ‘Not Now, Not Ever: Putting an End to Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland’ (hereby referred to as the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report) in 2015, which defined the landscape of domestic violence in Queensland and developed recommendations of action through three foundational elements; (i) community attitudes and behaviours, (ii) integrating and enhancing service responses, and (iii) strengthening justice system responses. The report produced 140 recommendations, all of which the government supported, and were used to inform the Queensland Government’s 10-year Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (the Strategy), aimed at eradicating domestic and family violence to ensure that ‘All Queenslanders live safely in their own homes and children can grow and develop in safe and secure environments’.9

The Strategy is informed by community and stakeholder perspectives across Queensland, and outlines a long-term program of actions in response to the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report recommendations. It is an ambitious and complex reform involving 14 implementing government agencies10 and supported by a $328.9 million investment over six years. The Strategy comprises seven supporting outcomes across the three foundational elements, as seen in Figure 1.1:

Figure 1.1. Overview of Strategy

Vision: A Queensland free from domestic and family violence

**Foundational elements**
- A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours
- An integrated response system that delivers the services and support that victims and perpetrators need
- A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account

**Supporting Outcomes (SO)**

1. SO1: Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence
2. SO2: Respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour are embedded in our community
3. SO3: Queensland community, business leaders, religious sporting and all government leaders are taking action and working together
4. SO4: Queensland’s workplaces and workforce challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers
5. SO5: Victims and their families are safe and supported
6. SO6: Perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account
7. SO7: The justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence

Source: Deloitte Access Economics adapted from Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy 2016-26


10 These agencies include Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Queensland Treasury, Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women, Public Service Commission, Queensland Police Service, Department of Education, Department of Health, Department of Housing and Public Works, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors, Queensland Corrective Services, Department of Employment, Small Business and Training, Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs.
**Action plans**

The Strategy is being delivered via a multi-departmental approach to systematically impact attitudes and behaviours ubiquitously embedded throughout society. The initiatives of the Strategy will be delivered through a series of four Action Plans to maintain flexibility around service delivery, as well as to adapt to, and build on achievements and lessons from prior Action Plans. An overview of the Action Plans, including their timing and focus, and how they sit within the broader Strategy is shown in Figure 1.2.

![Figure 1.2. Overview of Action Plans](image)

**Fourth Action Plan**
- Focus of this report
  - To foster change within the community beyond the life of the strategy. Action will ensure that momentum toward achieving the vision continues in a conscientious evidence-based and coordinated way.

**Third Action Plan**
- Focus of this report
  - To evolve the strategy by further embedding cultural change and system reform, and encouraging the move away from government-led action to community ownership.

**Second Action Plan**
- Focus of this report
  - To continue to implement the recommendations from the Taskforce and build upon the foundations of the First Action Plan. It will move the community towards a society where fewer people find excuses for violent behaviour or victim blame. Community members are empowered to take action to stop violence.

**First Action Plan**
- Focus of this report
  - To establish the foundations for the strategy and create the framework for driving change. This action will provide a strong base and create momentum for change in the community.

Source: Deloitte Access Economics adapted from Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy 2016–26

The **First Action Plan** was delivered with the initial report for 2015–16, which guided the Queensland Government’s response through to 30 June 2016. Two of the three remaining Action Plans will each cover a three-year period, and the fourth will cover a four-year period through to 2026.

The First Action Plan had the goal of setting the foundations for the Strategy, including the development of a framework to evaluate the Strategy, and development of integrated domestic and family violence service delivery models. In 2016, an evaluation of the First Action Plan was commissioned, with the outcome informing the creation of the Second Action Plan 2016–17 to 2018–19, which was released in November 2016. As at February 2019, 98 recommendations were completed and 23 commenced.
The **Second Action Plan** covers the three-year period from July 2016 to June 2019, and builds on the foundations established by the First Action Plan. Developed with the overarching goal to transform the way in which Queensland society (across local and state government, community based organisations, businesses and the service system) works together to better protect victim survivors and hold perpetrators to account\(^2\), the Second Action Plan involves the implementation of a host of systematic reforming initiatives. These initiatives include wide-ranging reforms such as the rolling-out of specialised domestic and family violence courts, and the introduction of new domestic and family violence specialist services to provide assistance to victim survivors and perpetrators alike, among an array of other initiatives and programs. The Queensland Government’s investment to implement recommendations from the Not Now, Not Ever Report is $328.9 million over six years from 2015-16.

The **Third Action Plan** is due to be released in the second half of 2019.

### 1.1.2 Evaluation Framework

Underpinning the entire Strategy is an evaluation framework that guides evaluation activities throughout the life of the Strategy. These evaluation activities will ensure the Strategy remains flexible and adaptable to a changing environment, transparent to the public and stakeholders to demonstrate responsible utilisation of resources, as well as to inform future implementation of initiatives through learning from past successes and challenges. The evaluation framework was developed by the Institute of Social Science Research (ISSR – The University of Queensland), and comprises four key evaluation components:

- **Process evaluation** to understand the implementation of the Strategy.
- **Flagship evaluations** to understand the effectiveness of key signature initiatives of the Strategy.
- **Outcomes evaluation** to develop an understanding of progress against key core outcomes at an interim and review phase.
- **Capability building** of the implementing agencies evaluation skills, to enable evaluation activities to be embedded throughout implementation of the Strategy.

The evaluation framework involves a number of reporting mechanisms that enhance and support performance management, oversight and review of the Strategy, which include:

- **Annual Scorecards** – allow for interim monitoring of outcomes of the Strategy over the course of the Strategy.
- **Action Plan Review** – a comprehensive evaluation that is conducted towards the end of each Action Plan’s implementation phase to allow for a review of the processes and outcomes to inform future Action Plan development and implementation.
- **Structured Review** – a review of the activities that are being implemented in each Action Plan to understand how they are progressing to achieving the stated objective.
1.2 **This report**

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) has engaged Deloitte Access Economics and Ipsos to support implementation of the evaluation framework for the Strategy. Figure 1.3 outlines the evaluation activities within the evaluation framework. This report relates to the Evaluation of the Action Plans, specifically the Second Action Plan, as denoted in red.

**Figure 1.3. Evaluation activities for the Strategy**

The purpose of the review of the Second Action Plan is to allow the DPC and partner agencies, as well as broader stakeholders throughout Queensland, to understand the impact of the Strategy through to 2019, and to inform the development of the Third Action Plan. This project will also give insights into where the Strategy can be modified to meet its long-term 10-year objective of the eradication of domestic and family violence throughout Queensland.

The evaluation framework links each of the seven supporting outcomes from the Strategy, to specific intermediate outcomes and data sources for measuring these. The intermediate outcomes provide additional granularity and detail for the supporting outcomes. In this sense, the supporting outcomes are the outcome evaluation questions, and the intermediate outcomes are the sub-evaluation questions. For a list of these please see Appendix B. These measurement methodologies feed into the Strategy’s data collection activities involving each implementing agency and the DPC.
The report comprises two parts, a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation. The process evaluation has been designed by Deloitte Access Economics as it was not included in the evaluation framework. At this early stage of implementing the Strategy, it was considered important to understand what has worked to date, to provide learnings in terms of process and implementation to support delivery of the remainder of the Strategy.

The outcome evaluation (part B), uses the 10 outcome evaluation questions within the evaluation framework and outlined in section 2 approach, and Appendix B. These outcome evaluation questions fall across the domains of effectiveness and relevance, efficiency and equity. There are seven evaluation questions within the effectiveness domain, each representing a supporting outcome. Within this, there are more detailed sub-evaluation questions derived from the intermediate outcomes. This report is structured by each of the evaluation questions—with each chapter presenting findings for that evaluation question/supporting outcome. It also covers the sub-evaluation questions/intermediate outcomes.
1.2.1 Structure
The report is structured as follows:

- **Chapter 1**: Introduction – is an overview of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy and this report
- **Chapter 2**: Approach – outlines the method adopted for undertaking the review, including data sources and notable limitations

**Part A**: Process evaluation – outlines findings against the three reporting domains of fidelity, implementation and governance:

- **Chapter 3**: Fidelity – provides findings on the two evaluation questions relating to the fidelity of the Second Action Plan
- **Chapter 4**: Implementation – provides findings on the three evaluation questions relating to the implementation of the Second Action Plan, including the effectiveness of governance arrangements

**Part B**: Outcome evaluation – outlines findings on progress to date against each of the supporting outcomes:

- **Chapter 5**: Supporting outcome one – reports progress and findings on the extent that Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence
- **Chapter 6**: Supporting outcome two – reports progress and findings on the extent that respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour is embedded in our community
- **Chapter 7**: Supporting outcome three – reports progress and findings on the extent that the Queensland community, business, religious, sporting, and all government leaders are taking action and working together
- **Chapter 8**: Supporting outcome four – reports progress and findings on the extent that Queensland workplaces and workforces challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers
- **Chapter 9**: Supporting outcome five – reports progress and findings on the extent that victim survivors and their families are safe and supported
- **Chapter 10**: Supporting outcome six – reports progress and findings on the extent that perpetrators have stopped using violence and are held to account
- **Chapter 11**: Supporting outcome seven – reports progress and findings on the extent that the justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence
- **Chapter 12**: Equity – analyses the extent to which progress has been made to address equity priorities for vulnerable population groups
- **Chapter 13**: Efficiency – analyses the two evaluation questions that relate to whether the Second Action Plan has been implemented efficiently
- **Chapter 14**: Conclusion and next steps – provides a summary of the progress and next steps to inform the Third Action Plan
2 Approach

The review has adopted a mixed methods approach that is aligned to the overarching Evaluation Framework of the Strategy

2.1 Evaluation questions

The evaluation framework contains a series of evaluation questions under four reporting domains, as shown in Table 2.1. The evaluation questions were adapted by Deloitte Access Economics, to reflect that this Review of the Second Action Plan is occurring in year three of a 10-year reform period. This means at this stage, it is not expected that any long-term impacts would be realised. Rather, the focus is on progress to date. For this reason, the impact evaluation questions have been removed, though they will be available as part of the Annual Highlights Card due for release before the end of 2019.

To inform the Third Action Plan, a series of process evaluation questions were added to help the DPC and other implementing agencies understand what is working from an implementation perspective, and what learnings exist for the forthcoming Third Action Plan.

A summary of the evaluation questions and amendments are included in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Evaluation questions under four reporting domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Included in Evaluation Framework</th>
<th>Included in this report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process evaluation questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What has been the focus of actions across the three foundational elements and seven supporting outcomes?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>What are the enablers and barriers to the effective implementation of the Second Action Plan? This may include processes and practices underpinning implementation, communication processes, data collection, evaluation and the timing of implementation.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do these enablers or barriers differ by context? This includes at the agency, interagency and whole-of-government level, across locations (rural, regional, metropolitan) and types of initiatives?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>How effective have the governance arrangements been for delivering the Second Action Plan?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact evaluation questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Has the incidence of domestic and family violence reduced?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Have deaths related to domestic and family violence reduced?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Has the percentage of Queenslanders who feel safe in their own homes increased?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>To what extent do Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence (supporting outcome one)?</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour embedded in our community (supporting outcome two)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do Queensland community, business, religious, sporting and all government leaders take action and work together (supporting outcome three)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do Queensland’s workplaces and workforce challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers (supporting outcome four)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are victim survivors and their families safe and supported (supporting outcome five)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have perpetrators stopped using violence and are they held to account (supporting outcome six)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the justice system deal effectively with domestic and family violence (supporting outcome seven)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>To what extent has progress been made to address equity priorities for vulnerable population groups (equity)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Have the initiatives and activities been economical, efficient, and effective to optimise success and deliver value for money to Queensland (noting the Second Action Plan covers years one through to four of a 10-year strategy)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do policy makers and program providers feel empowered to design and implement programs that are evaluation ready?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effectiveness questions relate to each of the seven supporting outcomes outlined in the Strategy. Under each of these, are the intermediate outcomes. This report sets out findings for each of the supporting outcomes, encompassing a synthesis of the findings from relevant intermediate outcomes. The list of intermediate outcomes and how they map to supporting outcomes is included in Appendix B.
2.2 **Data sources**

To respond to the evaluation questions, both quantitative and qualitative data sources were collected. This report draws on:

- secondary data collection (comprising flagship evaluation data, implementing agency Annual Scorecard data and other documents and secondary data)
- primary data collection (comprising interviews, surveys and focus groups)
- case studies.

### 2.2.1 Quantitative data sources

**Implementing agency Annual Scorecard data**

The evaluation framework identifies the data sources that correspond to each of the intermediate outcomes. This data is supplied to the DPC annually, as part of the Annual Scorecard. These data sources are agency specific.

A data request was made to each of the relevant agencies requesting a more detailed breakdown of the data provided to the DPC as part of the Annual Scorecards. This was to enable the Second Action Plan to consider more detailed sub-population analysis. A summary of the data source by agency that was requested and used within this report is outlined in Table 2.2.

While the specific request varied for each agency depending on their data fields, typically requested sub-population group data included:

- Location
- Whether the person identified as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander
- Sexuality
- Whether the person was from a culturally or linguistically diverse (CALD) background or person with disability
- Gender
- Age.

The sub-population group analysis relied on the categorisation applied by each individual agency to identify these sub-population groups, and so may be inconsistent. It is also important to note that this categorisation is high-level and does not reflect diversity within diversity. For example, conclusions may be drawn about people from CALD backgrounds, however the experiences of people from different CALD backgrounds may differ.
### Table 2.2 Data source by agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Commission (PSC)</td>
<td>EAP data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working for Queensland (WfQ) survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRA data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognise, Respond, Refer (RRR) completion data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Statisticians Office</td>
<td>QSS data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women (DCSYW)</td>
<td>DVConnect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCSYW administrative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OASIS data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month events calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Public Works (DHPW)</td>
<td>Queensland Homelessness Information Platform (QHIP) escaping domestic and family violence data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing register data (domestic and family violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing transfers data (domestic and family violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bond loans and rental grants data (domestic and family violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHS Homelessness data (provided by AIHW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Police Service (QPS)</td>
<td>Queensland Crime Victims Survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Police Referral Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney-General (DJAG)</td>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Death Review Unit data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QWIC data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJAG agency data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCM data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOPSI data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJG data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flagship evaluation reports
The DPC provided Deloitte Access Economics with flagship evaluation reports. As some flagship evaluations are still in progress, only those that had been finalised and approved for release to Deloitte Access Economics were provided. These are outlined in Table 2.3. The flagship evaluation reports were analysed thematically, with key themes identified.

Table 2.3 Flagship evaluation reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship evaluation</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Informed reported findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Implementation Evaluation Report for the Integrated Service Response Trial</td>
<td>DCSYW</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial (second evaluation report undertaken by Griffith University)</td>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim evaluation of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial</td>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Findings from KPMG- Initial Consultation phase – Culturally appropriate responses for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people involved in domestic and family violence</td>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Campaign Flagship Evaluation Draft report</td>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Campaign Evaluation Report (Phase 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government’s workplace response to domestic and family violence</td>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board research and data sharing protocols were subject to an informal evaluation</td>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Watch Flagship Evaluation</td>
<td>Department of Education (DoE)</td>
<td>Report not yet available (evaluation in process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Protective Assessment Framework</td>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Internal review – not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia’s National Research Organisation for Women’s Safety (ANROWS), has been engaged to explore the use of electronic monitoring of domestic and family violence perpetrators in a range of criminal law contexts</td>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Report not available at the time of preparing this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPMG report was provided to the DFVI Council on 12 July 2017 and evaluated ante-natal screening processes within the DoH.</td>
<td>DoH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other secondary data
Other documents and data provided to Deloitte Access Economics included:

- Government response implementation updates
- Implementing agency progress updates
- Closure reports
- DFVI Council updates and meeting notes.

For a full list of documents, see Appendix D.

2.2.2 Primary data collection
Development of the primary data collection was informed by the evaluation framework. The purpose of the primary data collection is to:

- Understand perspectives on progress, process and outcomes among key stakeholders involved with implementing and delivering the Second Action Plan
- Draw out key learnings and findings that will provide implementing agencies with practical insights to inform the development and implementation of the Third Action Plan
- Provide an additional data source for triangulation (or where data gaps exist), to respond to the key evaluation questions.

This report includes data collected from one-hour semi-structured interviews with a selection of implementing agencies. Agency representatives from the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group from the following agencies were invited to participate:

- Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women
- Queensland Corrective Services
- Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors
- Queensland Health
- Department of Housing and Public Works
- Department of Justice and Attorney-General
- Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships
- Department of Education
- Queensland Police Service
- Queensland Treasury

Members of the DFVI Council have also participated in semi-structured interviews and a focus group. One member of the Death Review and Advisory Board, and its secretariat, have participated in semi-structured interviews and a focus group. For a full list of stakeholder consultations undertaken, please see Appendix C.

2.2.3 Case studies
Purpose
The case studies provide detailed insights within a narrowly scoped action, to provide depth of analysis and key learnings. Twelve case studies, from the 84 action items, were developed.

The purpose of the case studies is to:

- provide supporting evidence for a small number of intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions
- emphasise findings of the review through practical examples
- identify enablers and barriers to implementing the Second Action Plan to provide learning opportunities to support development of the Third Action Plan
- celebrate success stories achieved to date
- highlight examples of activities achieved.
Selection process
To determine the actions for inclusion, two independent assessments of the actions within the Second Action Plan were undertaken. Each assessor removed actions they identified as not being commensurately scoped to provide detailed analysis. The independent assessments were compared, and a final list of potential actions for inclusion short-listed.

Deloitte Access Economics then worked with the DPC to identify those case studies that would assist in informing the Third Action Plan. In selecting these, consideration was given to ensuring there was representation across each of the seven outcome areas and two case studies from each of the three foundational elements.

Case studies were selected based on an appropriate mix of:
- single agency and cross-agency and/or cross-sector responses
- central and line agencies
- programs targeted at victim survivors and perpetrators
- representation of place (remote, regional, urban)
- service provision, legislative or systemic policy changes and community-wide initiatives
- initiatives affecting diverse population groups including people from CALD backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, people with disability; and service or sector types (health, housing, education)
- a minimum of one case study of an action focusing on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Flagship evaluation actions were only included where the purpose of the case study was to answer a different question from those within scope of the flagship evaluations.

Based on this selection process, the case studies identified for inclusion are outlined in Table 2.4. These are included in the Appendices, in the order of supporting outcome, which also aligns with whether they are targeting prevention, early intervention and response.

Table 2.4 Case studies within scope of this report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Supporting outcomes</th>
<th>Implementing agency</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Case study presenting the learnings from the Our Watch whole-school approach to respectful relationships education program (RREP) pilot. The pilot developed and trialled a whole-school approach to RRE in a primary school setting.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Case study presenting the learnings from the communications and engagement strategy, including several campaigns, the development of a media guide and other engagement activities.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCSYW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCDSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learnings from the Mackay Regional Council to encourage community (including business) ownership of the domestic and family violence reforms.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mackay Council and Taskforce</td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop and pilot guidance that supports procurement officers to consider if appropriate domestic and family violence workplace policies are in place for contractors and suppliers to government.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DHPW</td>
<td>Appendix I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To work in partnership with DVConnect to develop a model to provide immediate access to specialist domestic and family support and referral services within public and private maternity hospitals and emergency departments.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Appendix J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The case studies are included in Appendix F – Appendix Q.

2.3 Limitations

Due to the timing and resourcing of the Review of the Second Action Plan, the case studies use small sample sizes. This should be taken into consideration when reviewing the case studies.
Part A: Process evaluation

The process evaluation seeks to understand learnings to date to inform ongoing implementation of the Strategy.
3 Fidelity

Fidelity refers to the extent to which the Strategy was implemented as intended (Proctor, et al. 2010). It considers both the ‘dosage’ or quantity of what was delivered, and the quality of delivery. The intention is to understand not only whether a program was implemented as intended, but also if not delivered as planned, why this was the case and what the learnings can be for future.

In the context of the Second Action Plan, this considered whether the actions have been delivered as expected, and what adaptations, if any, were made and why. It considers the broader context within which the Second Action Plan operates. That is, whether the focus of the actions across the three foundational elements and seven supporting outcomes has been appropriate for delivering on the Strategy at this stage of its implementation. Two evaluation questions are included:

1. Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?
2. What has been the focus of actions across the three foundational elements and seven supporting outcomes?

3.1 Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?

The Second Action Plan comprises 84 actions, initiatives and programs. Of these, as shown in Figure 3.1, 61 have been delivered and 23 commenced. Chart 3.1 shows progress by implementing agency for the actions for which it was responsible.

Figure 3.1 Overall delivery of Second Action Plan

Given the scale and complexity of the reforms being undertaken, this delivery and implementation to date is commendable, a sentiment echoed during consultations with members of the Interdepartmental Committee, Executive Group and external stakeholders. Those implementing agencies that have ‘commenced’ but not ‘delivered’ actions tend to be those with the most actions to implement (DCSYW, DJAG and QPS). This need not be interpreted as slower progress. Rather, it may reflect the quantum and complexity of domestic and family violence related reforms being implemented. For example, one agency noted it has been actively responsible for more than 800 recommendations from a range of sources including domestic and family violence-related recommendations from the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, evaluations, and reviews of services, commissions and coroners’ reports.
While the delivery of actions and the completion of recommendations is crucial to the successful implementation of the Second Action Plan, some actions are perpetual in nature, and successful implementation requires ongoing support by agencies.

A consistent theme was that where actions were implemented more slowly than intended, this was often to resolve complexities and deliver superior outcomes. Some delivery dates and evaluation dates were adjusted to ensure successful delivery and comprehensive evaluations. For example, the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial was originally intended to operate for six months but was extended to 12 months before evaluation of the outcomes. The approach and timelines for the evaluation of the ISR trial were also amended to reflect an extended timeline for the completion of the evaluation and a comparative evaluation approach through a lens of one trial instead of three individual trials.

---

11 This chart reflects post-Machinery of Government (MoG) agencies with Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors (DCDSS) responsible for four actions, and Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women (DCSYW) responsible for 21 actions. Previously, the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services (DCCSDS) was responsible for the 25 actions.

It also considers MoG change as the former Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning has become Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs and Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. The Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs is responsible for one action (delivered).
One area in which the Second Action Plan may not have been implemented as intended relates to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander responses. Consultation with stakeholders, including government agencies and service providers located in central and regional offices, indicated that collaboration with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (DATSIP), as well as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities had not been optimised to ensure appropriateness. For example, regional consultations indicated it would be valuable if DATSIP were a member of the HRT. They reported this would facilitate appropriate information sharing between agencies, to better support the needs of victim survivors. This issue of culturally appropriate responses including in HRTs, and how to resolve it, may be further explored through the flagship evaluation currently under way. Where collaboration has occurred, for example the CJG in Cherbourg, there are early indications of positive uptake and engagement.

Another example is that information provided to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people should be culturally appropriate; a stakeholder noted that most written information and other material is in English and not culturally specific to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This particular challenge is, however, being addressed through the development and launch of culturally appropriate resources through DJAG. These resources have been developed through an iterative and detailed co-design process with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities and incorporate design features such as artwork and graphics to make the resources more accessible to their target audience.

May 2019 marked the release of the ‘Queensland’s Framework for Action’, demonstrating a government commitment to ‘a new way of working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, families and communities in the spirit of reconciliation’ to address the challenge of family violence. This framework is a government response to Recommendation 20 of the Death Review and Advisory Board’s 2016–17 Annual Report regarding the development of a specific Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander family violence strategy as a matter of urgent priority. Chapter 12 of this review contains more detail of the challenges faced in responding to the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who experience domestic and family violence.

Enablers and barriers of implementation are further assessed in section 4.1.

The consultation process showed the variation in attitudes toward implementing actions. For some agencies, ‘implementing as intended’ appears to mean delivering actions to demonstrate they have been achieved. For others, there is recognition of the perpetual nature of some of these actions, and that rather than considering them ‘delivered’ there may be merit in keeping them open for further refinement and ongoing implementation to ensure sustainability. The latter in particular suggests strong engagement with the intent of the actions including ensuring delivery of their intended outcomes, rather than simply the actions themselves.

---

12 The HRTs are comprised of key government agencies delivering frontline services (such as QPS, DJAG, QCS, QH, DHPW and CSYW). In addition, the HRTs are coordinated by a non-government specialist domestic and family violence organisation in the role of HRT Coordinator, which links the work of HRTs to the non-government service system. A key role of the HRTs is the sharing of relevant information to increase victim survivor safety and/or increase perpetrator accountability. Information sharing is further enabled through section 169C of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, which allows people to share information without consent in certain circumstances. DATSIP is not identified as a prescribed entity for the purposes of sharing such information as per section 169C. The DATSIP regional positions which support the work of integrated service responses ensure domestic and family violence investments by Government are culturally appropriate, place-based and tailored to local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population needs. They do this through connecting relevant Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations to the broader service system, including high risk teams. They have also established cultural advisory groups in several locations.

3.2 What has been the focus of actions across the three foundational elements and seven supporting outcomes?

3.2.1 Distribution of actions by foundational element

Of the 84 actions within the Second Action Plan, 35 fall under foundational element one, 22 actions under foundational element two and 27 actions under foundational element three (see Figure 3.2).

Figure 3.2: Actions by foundational element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An integrated response system that delivers the services and support that victims and perpetrators need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Distribution of actions by type

The actions within the Second Action Plan are being implemented and considered through many initiatives, pilots, legislation and enabling actions. In this analysis, an initiative is an action taken to drive changes, such as conducting research or evaluations, or publishing information, but is not considered to be a pilot or program in place. An ‘enabling’ action refers to what is not directly related to a recommendation of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, but forms part of the broader domestic and family violence reform program. Chart 3.2 shows the focus has been on initiatives.

Chart 3.2: Number of actions by type of action

- Enabling Action
- Initiatives
- Pilot
- Legislation

Vision: A Queensland free from domestic and family violence
Legislation
Nine actions proposing legislative amendments have been delivered. This represents significant progress given the complexity of legislative changes.

Of note, the legislative amendments within the Second Action Plan have occurred across each of the three foundational elements and five of the seven supporting outcomes. These legislative actions are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Legislative changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description of amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations Bill 2016 (Amendments came into effect March 2017)</td>
<td>The Queensland Government introduced new industrial relations legislation to the Queensland Parliament on 1 September 2016, proposing an entitlement to leave for victim survivors of domestic and family violence. The amendments also prohibit an employer from taking adverse action (including dismissal) against an employee or prospective employee, due to domestic and family violence. This came into effect March 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Protection and other Legislation Amendment Act 2016</td>
<td>Incorporating amendments identified by the review of the Act. This amendment was passed by Parliament on 11 October 2016 and received assent on 20 October 2016. Most provisions commenced on 30 May 2017. Introduction of a legislative framework to enable information sharing between key government and non-government entities for the purposes of enabling risk assessment and responding to serious domestic violence threats. This amendment also requires a court that is making or varying a Domestic Violence Order, to consider any existing family law order it is aware of and whether it needs to be varied or suspended if it is inconsistent with the protection needed by the victim survivor. The amendments also provide for the implementation of automatic recognition of DVOs from other Australian jurisdictions in Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2016</td>
<td>Contains sexual assault counselling privilege amendments to the Evidence Act 1977. The commencement date was 1 December 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (passed 11 October 2016)</td>
<td>Provide for the implementation of automatic recognition of DVOs from other Australian jurisdictions in Queensland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Government Response implementation update as at 31 August 2018; domestic and family violence Legislative amendments since 2015
Pilots
Stakeholders have commented that a number of actions are pilot focused, intended to build an evidence base, determine governance standards, and establish systems in place and resource requirements of programs. Six of the 84 actions are considered to be pilots. This work precedes plans to scale successful models and begin specifically focusing on diverse populations, including those identified as vulnerable in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. For example, DCSYW has acknowledged that progress in vulnerable populations has been limited, with a preliminary focus upon building the evidence base regarding the scale and the need of vulnerable population groups (for example, older people and people who identify as LGBTIQ).

Consultations with members of the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group demonstrated a desire to extend current programs, particularly pilots and trials drawing on the lessons learned from their evaluations. This includes whether to introduce the pilots into different urban, regional or discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, or to start embedding the process in scaling up.

A focus on pilots during this early stage of implementation of the Strategy is appropriate. However, as the Strategy and subsequent Action Plans progress, it will be important for implementing agencies to scale up – where deemed effective and appropriate. The DoE case study (Appendix F) and the Disability and Elderly Abuse Trial (DEAT) case study (Appendix L) provide examples of considerations for scaling pilots, including how this can be achieved efficiently without diluting the quality and effectiveness of the programs. Further, scaling pilots could consider how these pilots could be adapted to meet the needs of those population groups identified in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report as being vulnerable, such as people from CALD backgrounds.

Foundational element one: A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours

To date, focus within supporting outcome one has been on increasing knowledge on what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence. This aligns with the knowledge-attitude-behaviour (KAB) model, promoting knowledge creation, which then influences attitudes and behaviour. At this early stage in the Strategy, it is appropriate to be focused on increasing understanding and influencing attitudes. Behaviour change would not yet be expected.

Figure 3.3 Knowledge-attitude-behaviour (KAB) model to behaviour change

Changing ideas, customs and social behaviours are some of the more difficult recommendations from the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. This is why four of the Strategy’s seven supporting outcomes focus on culture, to help to understand the drivers of behavioural and attitudinal changes in communities.
Foundational element one, *a significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours is required*, is where most of the actions have been delivered. Of the 61 actions delivered across all three foundational elements, 34 (56%) are within foundational element one. These actions have been delivered through:

- A combination of broad awareness-raising activities using mass communication channels
- Reforms that build domestic and family violence capability into key institutions, for example: workplaces, schools, health system and media institutions, including the media guide developed by the DPC.

Several actions are ongoing for agencies. For example, the actions and recommendations relating to educational reforms (supporting outcome two) include continuing to review, maintain and promote the respectful relationships education program (RREP). The intention is to ensure best practice and current research is reflected in the program.

**Foundational element two: An integrated response system that delivers the services and support that victim survivors and perpetrators need**

Across foundational element two, 15 of the 22 actions have been delivered. One area of progress has been the roll out and implementation of the ISR trials in urban locations, regional locations and in a discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. The three ISR trial sites are fully operational, however progress is continuous and the insights from the Early Implementation Evaluation Report in 2017 have been applied to systems processes and practices. The results of the second stage evaluation of the three trials will further inform the practices relating to the use of information technology platforms and common risk and safety assessment tools that have been implemented. The evaluation of the trials to date has been focused on processes involved with the establishment of the model, presenting indicative findings from the beginning months of the implementation of the model. It is noted that evaluating the effectiveness of the models, and the early outcomes is a priority for delivery in 2019.

Other areas of focus within foundational element two relate to services that victim survivors may come into contact with, including health and housing services. This is important to ensure that victim survivors have greater access to services they require. Within the evaluation framework, many of the indicators relate to housing, particularly, crisis accommodation. This may encourage a focus in this area, which is also emphasised in the proportion of funding directed to crisis support. Given the outcome is also focused on achieving long-term victim survivor recovery, this will also be important. Mechanisms for achieving this include through funding (currently 24% of funding is directed toward recovery) and through programs such as the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program.

Of note, the focus of foundational element two is on victim survivors and perpetrators more broadly, rather than responses for specific population groups who may require more specialised services. There is one action for older victim survivors, people with disability or who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people. There may be merit in ensuring all victim survivors are having their needs met, including among diverse population groups. This is discussed in more detail in chapter 12.
**Foundational element three: A stronger justice system response that will prioritise victim survivor safety and hold perpetrators to account**

In terms of holding perpetrators to account, the focus of foundation element three to date has been on the justice system holding perpetrators to account, more so than supports that seek to influence perpetrators’ behaviour, pursuing taking responsibility for their behaviour, as discussed in more detail in chapter 10. Despite the progress made to date, only three of the 27 actions are exclusively related to supporting outcome six (holding perpetrators accountable). Enhancing the accountability of perpetrators in terms of responsibility for their behaviour, not just within the justice system, could be a focus for future Action Plans, building upon the work already undertaken. This will require a focus on perpetrator programs, including monitoring and evaluating their effectiveness. Similarly to foundational element two, consideration of diverse population groups is warranted.

This foundational element has also emphasised prioritising victim survivor safety, indirectly through holding perpetrators accountable and directly through actions aimed at victim survivors and their families. Progress achieved includes that of the specialist domestic and family violence courts which offer one mechanism to deal exclusively with all civil and criminal domestic and family violence matters. The evaluation of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Court trial concluded that the original trial had been promising, with results indicating that the needs of victim survivors were more likely to be met at the Southport Specialist Court compared to Ipswich Court.

Across foundational element three, 12 of the 27 actions have been delivered. Foundational work has occurred in relation to the perpetrator actions, with the commencement of a review of practice standards, and the roll-out and consideration of perpetrator services and programs across Queensland. DCSYW is currently undertaking a review of the Professional Practice Standards: working with men who use domestic and family violence, which will guide the delivery of funded perpetrator intervention programs with new contemporary standards. This will be complemented by a quality assurance framework and audit process to ensure ongoing compliance with the Professional Practice Standards for working with perpetrators of domestic and family violence, to add system accountability.

Services for perpetrators of domestic and family violence are available in all trial locations of the ISR, and are a part of each location’s ISR model. One of the key concepts that underpins all elements of the Common Risk Assessment and Safety Framework in the trials, is that both victim survivors and perpetrators should be the focus of all service providers’ attention and activities. This is in contrast to past practices that have focused on risk assessment and risk management for victim survivors alone. This shift acknowledges the perpetrator as a key to proactively minimising harm, both in the context of single cases, but also given the propensity to reoffend with multiple victim survivors.
4 Implementation

Key findings

Leadership has been an important enabler of the Second Action Plan across different levels—from people championing particular activities to prevent domestic and family violence in communities, through to Ministerial leadership.

Collaboration underpinned by mutual respect of each other’s skills, experience, remit and processes has facilitated implementation of the Second Action Plan. In instances where implementation has been successful, effective collaboration has facilitated information and data sharing, building strong networks between government agencies, and between government and non-government providers, in addition to promoting a culture of change and continual improvement on the ground.

The degree to which implementing agencies, service providers and the broader community are engaged in implementing the Strategy is an important enabler, as is innovation.

Barriers identified included the allocation of sufficient funding/resources to enable agencies and service providers to implement programs effectively, operationalising information sharing legislation and focusing on outputs of implementation rather than outcomes.

Stakeholder buy-in and prioritising the domestic and family violence reforms where other reform agendas existed were also barriers.
4.1 What are the enablers and barriers to the effective implementation of the Second Action Plan? This may include processes and practices underpinning implementation, communication processes, data collection, evaluation and the timing of implementation.

Review of documentation, as well as consultation carried out to date, has identified a number of enablers and barriers that have affected the implementation of the Second Action Plan. It is evident that some of these factors are applicable across the initiatives and agencies, and some are context specific (this is explored in section 4.2).

**Enablers**

**Leadership**

One of the dominant themes is the role of leadership in facilitating and driving effective implementation. Cited by a range of stakeholders, as well as documented in various flagship evaluations, strong leadership and ownership of the issue and the solution is a common element in the success of the Second Action Plan to date. Importantly, leadership as an enabler occurs across different levels—from people championing particular activities to prevent domestic and family violence in communities, through to Ministerial leadership.

A number of agency representatives from the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group highlighted the emphasis placed on addressing domestic and family violence by the Queensland Premier, Hon Annastacia Palaszczuk. This has reportedly created a mandate for Ministers and Directors General to prioritise the recommendations and actions set out in ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ and the Action Plan.

There are also examples where local leadership has been cited as a success factor for driving change on the ground, such as the role of school principals in implementing and embedding respectful relationships education (RRE) into curriculum and culture (see DoE case study in Appendix F), the local mayor of Mackay (see Section 6), the sustained commitment of all coroners to the Queensland Domestic Family and Violence Death Review process, and the work of the Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce.

Findings from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) also supported these findings (Chart 4.1). Of the survey participants, nearly 60% identified leadership/leadership support as an enabler for the implementation of actions within each agency. Seventy per cent of project team members\(^\text{14}\) identified the importance of leadership as an enabler, in contrast with nearly 46% of executive staff.

\(^\text{14}\) A project team member is defined as a staff member who has a ‘significant involvement/daily contact with the implementation of the Strategy.'
Collaboration

Complementing leadership is collaboration, in particular at an operational and service provision level. Several stakeholders cited that successful collaboration had to be underpinned by mutual respect of each other’s skills, experience, remit and processes. In instances where implementation has been successful, effective collaboration has facilitated information and data sharing, building strong networks between government agencies, and between government and non-government providers resulting in a culture of change and continual improvement. Networks built between government agencies, and between government and non-government providers, has contributed to greater trust. Given the important role of integration of services within the Strategy and supporting outcomes (for example supporting outcome three which specifically makes reference to networks), this provides a platform for elevating the role of collaboration.

As an example, the triage component of the DEAT model and the Gold Coast’s QPS Taskforce’s operations, now incorporates input from the disability and aged care sectors to enable sharing of information across agencies and sectors. The embedded officer participates in the triage case conferences alongside personnel from QPS, QCS (which includes Probation and Parole/community corrections and Custodial Corrections), courts, DCSYW, and the Domestic Violence Prevention Centre. Information shared during triage includes case history, any signs of domestic and family violence, and available service responses from the disability, aged care and domestic and family violence sectors. This enables the exchange of information that together creates a clearer picture of the key issues. This collaborative model on the Gold Coast has resulted in a stronger relationship network between QPS and sector providers, facilitating referrals within the network (see the DEAT case study in Appendix L).

Another example of effective collaboration across implementing agencies is the development of the online DV1 form by DJAG, led by a project team created within the Integrated Criminal Justice (ICJ) Program. The ICJ group includes Queensland Courts, Youth Justice, QPS, DCSYW, QCS, Office of Director of Public Prosecutions and State Penalties Enforcement Registry. In this instance, ICJ also partnered with the digital transformation team within Justice Services to develop and implement the online form.
Collaboration is occurring across government agencies and with service providers. For example, one Hospital and Health Service (HHS) identified they are working in close partnership with the local domestic and family violence service, supporting health practitioners to refer patients (see QH case study in Appendix J). A member of the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group stated that significant progress has been made in bringing together different sectors. This has enabled those working across the service sector to share knowledge, skills and pathways for clients. One mechanism for doing this has been to embed specialist personnel in services, particularly within government services (see the DEAT case study in Appendix L). Future Action Plans may wish to consider how collaboration can be incentivised by government, between government and non-state government organisations.

Results of the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) also supported these findings (Chart 4.1), with 27.7% of survey participants identifying collaboration/support across agencies as an enabler for the implementation of actions within each agency. Executives and project team members more heavily weighted the importance of collaboration and support across agencies and the clear direction and priorities of the Strategy as enablers than the resources allocated.

**Engagement**

The degree to which implementing agencies, service providers and the broader community are engaged in implementing the Strategy is important.

Results from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) show that, overall, Queensland Government agency staff appear to be engaged with the implementation of the Second Action Plan. Almost all survey respondents agreed (a score of six to 10) that they have a clear understanding of their agency’s role, with 75% of respondents responding with an eight or higher (Chart 4.2 Q1:a). More than 50% of survey respondents strongly agreed (a score of 10) that their agency was committed to implementing the prevention strategy (Chart 4.2 Q1:b). There appears to be a strong understanding of the importance of each agency’s actions within the broader strategy, with 100% of all survey respondents scoring an eight or higher in agreement to the statement ‘In general, the action(s) for which my agency has been responsible will contribute to the overarching goal and objectives of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy’ (Chart 4.2 Q1:e).

While it appears that most survey respondents agree, to some extent, that leadership within the agency is helping to drive implementation, there is some variability in the results (Chart 4.2 Q1:f). There appears to be greater variance in agreement that leadership helps to drive implementation (Chart 4.2 Q1:f) within project teams than non-project team staff. More specifically, 23% (seven of 31) project team members responded with a neutral to negative score to the question ‘the leadership team within my agency helps to drive implementation of the action(s) for which my agency is responsible’. In contrast, just one (of 27) non-project team member responded with a six or below for Q1:f. This signals that there may be some concerns from staff within project teams regarding the role leadership has played in implementing agency actions to date.
Chart 4.2 Implementing agency staff reported level of agreement with statements relating to the agencies role with The Second Action Plan, 2019

Q1:a) I have a clear understanding of my agency’s role in implementing the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (n=58)
Q1:b) My agency is committed to implementing the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (n=58)
Q1:e) In general, the action(s) for which my agency has been responsible will contribute to the overarching goal and objectives of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (n=58)
Q1:f) The leadership team within my agency helps to drive implementation of the action(s) for which my agency is responsible (n=58)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using implementing agency survey, 2019

Note: Box plots are used throughout this report when a comparison of the distribution of two variables provides as much value as a comparison of the central tendency (mean or median value) of two variables. Simplistically, the box plot displays five summary statistics that explain the central tendency and distribution of a variable. Each bar in the box plot represents, in ascending order, the minimum response (not including outliers), first quartile (value at which 25% of all responses fall under), median (value at which 50% of all people responded), Third quartile (value at 75% of all people responded), and maximum response. For a more in-depth understanding of how to understand a box plot, see Appendix R.

Results from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) show that, overall, Queensland Government agency staff appear to be engaged with the implementation of the Second Action Plan. Most survey respondents agreed (a score of six to 10) that they have a clear understanding of their specific role, with 75% of participants responding with an eight or higher (Chart 4.3 Q2:a). More than 50% of survey respondents strongly agreed (a score of 9 or 10) that their agency and other agencies have been supportive during the implementation of actions (Chart 4.3 Q2:b and Q2:c).

Questions Q2:d and Q2:e of the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) asks the respondent to consider the degree to which they perceive their role in implementing the Strategy as a priority, as well as how they perceive the commitment of their colleagues. The survey results show that project team members tend to have a higher self-perception of how they prioritise their role (Chart 4.3 Q2:d – mean of 9.13) compared to their corresponding perceptions of the commitment of their colleagues (Chart 4.3 Q2:e – mean of 7.83). A closer analysis shows that 16 of 31 (52%) project team members responded with a lower score to the degree to which they believe that the Strategy is a priority to their colleagues than they scored for the belief that the Strategy is a priority to them. A Kruskal-Wallis H statistical test confirms that these two groups of scores are statistically significant at a level
of 0.05. These results indicate that while staff consider themselves to be committed to implementing the Second Action Plan, there is some scepticism as to the commitment of their colleagues. These results may also relate to the finding, where staff of implementing agencies may feel that leadership is less committed.

Chart 4.3 Implementing agency staff reported level of agreement with statements relating to the staff role with The Second Action Plan, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2:a</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2:b</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2:c</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2:d</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2:e</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2:a) I have a clear understanding of my role in implementing the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2016-2026) (n=58)

Q2:b) I have been supported within my agency to implement the action(s) for which my agency is responsible under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (n=58)

Q2:c) I have been supported by colleagues across other government agencies to implement action(s) for which my agency is responsible under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (n=58)

Q2:d) I consider my work to implement the action(s) for which my agency is responsible under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy to be a priority for my role (n=58)

Q2:e) My colleagues consider implementing the action(s) for which our agency is responsible under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy to be a priority (n=58)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using implementing agency survey, 2019

Innovation

Stakeholders highlighted innovative approaches and flexibility to implement actions as important to implementation. Evidence of this has been demonstrated in some of the case studies and pilots. The DJAG case study describes the online DV1 forms, the first of its kind (see Appendix P); the DEAT case study describes the experiences to date of having an embedded officer from DCDSS working alongside the QPS taskforce at the Gold Coast (see Appendix L). DCSYW has also initiated innovation workshops to identify solutions to address waitlists for perpetrator programs. The DHPW case study (see Appendix I) shows how government can use levers to influence change within organisations. Co-design has also been a consistent more innovative approach that has aided implementation and design, including in specific communications campaigns (see Appendix G) and with communities such as the Mossman CJG (see Appendix Q).

15 A Kruskal-Wallis H test is a non-parametric rank-based test that can be used to determine statistical differences in the central tendency of groups with an ordinal dependent variable. Output results: χ² (2) = 6.352, P-value = 0.0117. Level of significance is assumed to be 0.05. Sample size of groups is 31.
**Barriers**
Several barriers to implementation have also become apparent through the consultations undertaken to date and flagship evaluations.

**Inconsistent information sharing**
Operationalising information sharing legislation, through changing ways of working was cited as a barrier by a number of stakeholders.16 One example of challenges in sharing information is when perpetrators commence behaviour change programs to ensure victim survivor safety. Another example includes extending information sharing to the broader service sector such as disability and aged care service providers. The Early Implementation Evaluation Report for the ISR trial reported that agencies now have licence to share information.

Some of this was attributed to organisational barriers, such as organisational risk adversity as a barrier to information sharing, suggesting that, particularly in the community sector, some agencies may be hesitant to share information in the absence of client consent despite the guidelines.

**Prioritisation of reform activities**
Preventing and responding to domestic and family violence is an area of importance, which has been reflected in consultations, however it was also seen as one of many reform agendas for agencies to deliver. In some cases, it was a challenge due to prioritisation, capability and agility, particularly where investment was not always perceived to be commensurate with what was required to implement actions or recommendations.

In some cases agencies noted that senior buy-in is challenging, particularly where this related to agencies that had a broad remit and other reforms or recommendations from other inquiries and reviews to implement. Just as senior leadership was noted as an enabler of the reforms, a lack of senior buy-in among certain agencies and delegation to non-executive levels can be a barrier to effective implementation.

The challenge of competing priorities was also reflected at the service level. It was noted through consultations that competing priorities across schools can impact the delivery of RRE. Information about RRE is provided to principals through the P-12 Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Framework (CARF), which states that schools should provide health and wellbeing education and links to the RREP. Schools negotiate competing curriculum priorities in terms of delivery of RRE. Similarly, businesses within the Mackay case study, reflected there may be instances where other business needs took priority.

It was also highlighted within the QH case study (Appendix J) that sufficient senior buy-in provides accountability for driving the uptake and sustainability of training, encouraging responsibility and someone taking ownership and championing and prioritising the resources.

**Compliance focus**
As discussed in section 3.2, some agencies have focused on outputs of implementation and that these are ‘delivered’, rather than the sought after outcomes.

This is not to say the outcomes have not been achieved, but rather that leadership and an outcomes-focus are potentially more important than compliance. Given the early stage of the Strategy, it is too early to tell whether outcomes are being achieved in many cases.

---

16 Further, regulatory, legislative and other supporting infrastructure that differs across jurisdictions or agencies have been identified as impediments to progress.
Workforce capability and capacity
Other barriers that were raised included the availability of appropriately skilled workers to deliver actions related to the reforms. For example, some stakeholders noted that staffing was a challenge with implementation due to the nature of structural changes, and specialised and challenging work. Other examples include the capability of the mainstream domestic and family violence service sector to be able to identify and respond (either directly or via referral) to the needs of diverse population groups, such as people with disability and those who are from CALD backgrounds, which are discussed further in chapter 5 (supporting outcome one).

Funding/resource allocation
A barrier to the implementation of the Strategy is the allocation of sufficient funding/resources to enable agencies and service providers to implement programs and actions effectively. Findings from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) identified that 39% of survey respondents viewed the insufficient allocation of resources as a key barrier to the implementation of their actions. In addition, 26% of survey participants, including 40% of executives, identified the issue of competing priorities as a key barrier, with many survey participants citing a ‘lack of dedicated staff’ as a key issue in implementing actions (Chart 4.4).

Chart 4.4 Implementing agency staff top seven identified barriers for the implementation of the Second Action Plan, 2019

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using implementing agency survey, 2019
4.2 How do these enablers or barriers differ by context? This includes at the agency, interagency and whole-of-government level, across locations (rural, regional, metropolitan) and types of initiatives?

Some of the enablers and barriers outlined in 4.1 are consistent across contexts. Leadership is mentioned by stakeholders as a key enabler across agencies, seniority, workplace (community, private or government) or subject matter. As described in supporting outcome three (chapter 7), there are numerous examples of strong leadership driving implementation of the Second Action Plan.

The Implementing Agency Survey (2019) shows engagement is relatively consistent across the Queensland Government agency staff who responded. Innovation has appeared in a range of contexts, including within government agencies, in local communities, in metropolitan and regional areas. Collaboration, while a consistent theme, manifests differently depending on the context and who is involved. For example, the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial evaluation identified features that facilitated strong relationships between stakeholders, including being highly collegial, collaborative, court-involved and focused on problem solving. Specifically, it found the weekly working group meetings assisted in breaking down silos. Identifying mechanisms that facilitate collaboration may be a useful future implementation approach. Some stakeholders also noted that the governance structure with the Interdepartmental Committee and Executive Group was pivotal in facilitating collaboration at the executive level.

In other more service-system contexts, other mechanisms such as embedded officers have facilitated collaboration and service system integration. Several examples are discussed with reference to supporting outcome three (chapter 7), and include a social worker from the local domestic and family violence service being embedded within a hospital one day per week to facilitate referrals, and the role of the DCDSS embedded officer in the DEAT model. In Mossman, the CJG has worked collaboratively with DJAG, using principles of co-design and extensive and regular community consultations to design and implement an appropriate community response to domestic and family violence for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

During consultations, including consultations for case studies, deep specialist expertise was identified as an enabler for implementation of effective programs (for example the QPS, DEAT and DoE case study). Government agencies have identified knowledge and specialisation gaps in their response to domestic and family violence. An embedded officer has been employed to fill these gaps. This is a crucial component in building specialised skills for more generalised agency workers and services. If the embedded officer within the DEAT model was removed, residual benefits from building capacity in other workers would remain.

Where a wide-ranging knowledge of domestic and family violence was required, it was preferable to have workers with a broader understanding and perspective of domestic and family violence. For instance, one agency identified that collaboration between sectors and agencies has increased over the past three years, in part due to the presence of specialist officers from other sectors within the agency. This has facilitated knowledge and skills transfer, creating broader domestic and family knowledge among all workers, and more integrated systems and processes. In general, the two-way sharing of knowledge, experience and intelligence was cited as a mutually beneficial feature of these approaches.

Similarly, the barriers identified tended to be consistently raised across government agencies, locations and the whole-of-government level. One exception to this is the workforce related barriers, which were often exacerbated in regional and remote areas.

When considering rural and remote regions, there are additional barriers which arise. Cultural competencies, retention and training of staff are crucial aspects in ensuring that workers in domestic and family violence services appropriately respond to cases of domestic and family violence. This is a particular challenge in rural and regional areas where geographical challenges place a strain on the recruitment and retention of staff and access to training.
It was suggested that increasing HRT stakeholders’ accountability to take responsibility for ensuring the workforce is building its capability could aid a refocus on core work in these regions. Regional workers expressed that they would like to incentivise more local staff to apply for positions, where possible, to increase certainty in continuing investments in skill sets and capabilities. While noting that all agencies and non-government organisations working in domestic and family violence have responsibility for workforce development and training, stakeholders nonetheless felt HRTs could also play a role in this, noting HRTs responsibilities lie in risk assessment and the development of multi-agency safety management strategies. It is noted however, that this role is outside the scope of the functions of the HRTs (and HRT core members), as informed by the evidence-based HRT intervention model provided in the Common Risk and Safety Framework.

In the context of some rural and remote communities, service demand or resourcing may result in fewer individuals working in services, with lower likelihood of gender diversity within the service. It was cited by stakeholders that this can pose a barrier in some cultural contexts when it may be difficult for people accessing the service to build a trusting relationship with someone of a different gender.

Another geographical consideration raised about workforce capability was issues around fly-in, fly-out (FIFO) workers. Funding was perceived to be insufficient for regions to use FIFO employees, potentially offering services otherwise unavailable in the communities.

4.3 How effective have the governance arrangements been for delivering the Second Action Plan?

The governance of the domestic and family violence reform program is depicted in Figure 4.1.

The DFVI Council provides independent oversight of the domestic and family violence reforms. Their Terms of Reference are to:

- Monitor implementation of the recommendations of the report of the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence ‘Not, Now, Not Ever’ report and the Strategy.
- Serve as champions of the Strategy, create a shared responsibility for achieving the vision of the Strategy and create links between government, business, industry and community sectors to achieve the vision.17

Within government, the reforms are led by the Premier, together with the Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. As outlined in section 1, there are 14 implementing agencies. Directors-General and Commissioners from these agencies form the Child Protection, Youth, Youth Justice and Domestic and Family Violence Inter Departmental Committee (IDC). They are supported by the Domestic and Family Violence Executive Group, which is chaired by the DPC.

17 Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Terms of Reference.
Aspects of the governance arrangements have been both effective and challenging, many of which mirror the enablers and barriers to implementation.

In terms of leadership, the presence of the reforms being led by the Premier and Minister has been cited as an effective feature of the governance arrangements as it signals the importance of the Strategy and overall implementation of the Second Action Plan. Senior reaching leadership commitment and a clear authorising environment stemming from senior leaders shows that the Strategy is an unwavering reform for the government.

The DFVI Council was considered to be an effective mechanism for ensuring oversight and accountability, independent of government. An independent report is tabled in parliament, providing a level of transparency and analysis from an independent perspective. Members of the DFVI Council expressed there exists potential for disconnect between frontline services’ perspectives on progress and government. For an efficient and effective delivery of the reform, bridging any potential disconnect is important. All voices should be captured from multiple perspectives, from the frontline services through to leadership in government, to allow the DFVI Council insight into the implementation and progress of outcomes. This includes representation across agencies and levels within the system – from victim survivors and perpetrators, to service providers and breadth of government agency representation in terms of agency and role. This creates space for those who may not be consistently heard to share their own experiences and perspectives.

The governance structures were also seen as mechanisms for a more collaborative approach, in which agencies were responsible not only to their Ministers, but also each other. This has enabled agencies to see the co-dependencies associated with actions, and to work closely together ensuring shared responsibility. It was noted that the opportunities for this cross-agency collaboration in governance groups from the IDC down to local level working groups and committees has reinforced shared responsibility. Given collaboration has been an ongoing theme, it may be useful for the future governance to be used to drive further interagency accountability and collaboration.

---

18 Governance and Oversight Framework, as at August 2018, has been updated to reflect current department names.
Many agencies commented that compliance and red tape, such as the reporting requirements, are impediments to efficient governance. It was noted that at times these can be excessive, diluting the focus on delivery and outcomes. For example, it was expressed that there was a heavy focus on compliance rather than strategy, and that there needs to be a renewed focus on thinking, rather than a governance structure reliant on reporting. One agency suggested that the focus of senior leaders should be on strategy, investment and risk management as opposed to a compliance focus.

The issue of red tape and extensive approvals process was also apparent in the results of the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) (Chart 4.5 Q3:a and Q3:b). Survey responses show that there are signs of concerns with the role of governance and approval structures in place to enable implementation and cross-agency collaboration. More specifically, while the majority (75%) of Queensland Government agency staff agree that approval structures within agencies enable timely implementation of the Strategy, 25% of respondents reported a neutral to negative response (a score of six or below) (Chart 4.5 Q3:a).

This variation is partly driven by the differing perceptions of executive and non-executive staff. Non-executive staff tend to have more negative perceptions of the timeliness of approval structures, scoring a median of 7.0 and an inter-quartile range of 3.0. This is in comparison to a median score of 8.5 and an inter-quartile range 2.25 for executive-level survey respondents. This suggests that non-executive staff are more impacted by a slower approvals process than executive staff.

There appears to be significant disagreement throughout agencies with the statement that governance structures have enabled better cross-agency collaboration (Chart 4.5 Q3:b). While more than 50% of survey respondents agreed with the statement, approximately 25% of agency staff members disagreed (a score of five or below), or are neutral to this statement. This variation appears to be consistent over executive and non-executive survey respondents, as well as project and non-project team members.

There appears to be a greater consensus among government agency staff members as to the effectiveness of data collection and research activities that have informed actions within the Second Action Plan. Overall, 75% of government staff agree that their agency has effectively engaged with stakeholders to assist the implementation of actions, as well as responsibly designed actions from an evidence-base. There were no recorded disagreements to either of these statements.
Chart 4.5 Implementing agency staff reported level of agreement with statements relating to the role of governance, collaboration and data collection and sharing in relation to the implementation of the Second Action Plan, 2019

Q3:a) The approval structures within my agency enable timely implementation of the action(s) which I am responsible for implementing (n=55)

Q3:b) The governance structures established to implemented the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (i.e. Interdepartmental CEO Committee, Domestic and Family Violence Executive Group) have enabled better cross-agency collaboration (n=52)

Q3:c) My agency has effectively engaged with stakeholders to help implement those action(s) for which my agency is responsible under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (n=54)

Q3:d) The design and implementation of action(s) for which my agency is responsible have been informed by an evidence-base (n=54)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using implementing agency survey, 2019
Part B: Outcome evaluation

The outcome evaluation provides findings on progress against each of the supporting outcomes.
5 Supporting outcome one

To what extent do Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence?

Key findings

Knowledge – there are high levels of knowledge of the physical behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence, and where to access help. Gaps in knowledge appear associated with non-physical forms of domestic and family violence. It is likely to be too early to observe changes at a population level, given the time required to observe change.

- Up to 93% of Queenslanders understood that all six behaviours presented in the QSS are domestic and family violence, this remained unchanged from 2017. There is a need to focus on increasing knowledge and seriousness of non-physical types of domestic and family violence, including psychological abuse, technology-facilitated abuse and financial abuse.
- Up to 90% of Queenslanders understand that all types of domestic and family violence are serious. However, for a small proportion of the population, there is a gap between knowledge of what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence and the seriousness of this behaviour.
- The number of DVConnect clients has risen over time. This is an indicator of the degree to which Queenslanders are seeking support, a proxy indicator of changes in help-seeking behaviour. Anecdotally however, it is reported that in some rural and regional communities, victims and perpetrators are not sure where and how to access services.

Attitudes – more than 76% of Queenslanders agree or strongly agree with the statement: it is important our culture respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes.

- There has been a statistically significant decline in the proportion of Queenslanders who strongly agree or agree with this statement between 2017 and 2018.
- Nine percent of the Queensland population disagrees or strongly disagrees with this statement.

Behaviour – while more than half of all bystanders have taken action—40% say they did not do anything when they became aware of domestic and family violence involving a neighbour. This needs to be addressed.

- Bystanders are more likely to respond based on the closeness of their relationship with the victim survivor or perpetrator.
- They are more likely to respond to physical domestic and family violence rather than non-physical domestic and family violence.

Note: Vignettes are used throughout the outcome evaluation section of this report to highlight examples of particular system outcomes and challenges, pertinent to the supporting outcome discussed in the evaluation chapter. The following vignette is from the Death Review and Advisory Board Annual Report 2016–17 and highlights that domestic and family violence comprises different types of behaviours—from physical abuse, sexual violence, controlling behaviour and emotional abuse including isolation. To recognise and respond appropriately to domestic and family violence, it is important people understand the types of behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence, and the multi-faceted and complex nature of domestic and family violence.
**Dominique**

“Two-month-old female infant Dominique, died from multiple severe injuries inflicted by her father, Ian, approximately one week prior to her death. Despite efforts from her mother, Amy, to seek medical attention, Dominique’s access to potentially life-saving medical care was prevented by Ian’s repeated refusal to allow others to intervene in the lead up to her death.

While there was no recorded history of domestic and family violence prior to the death in this relationship, it became apparent during police investigations that Ian had socially isolated Amy and exerted significant power and control over her. In her statement to police, Amy disclosed that Ian was physically violent towards her, including striking her in the head with his fist or other implements, and hitting her head against walls when angry or upset.

He was also noted as being emotionally manipulative, and had socially isolated her from her family, increasing her dependency on him. Ian further isolated Amy by restricting her communication with others by limiting her access to the computer and internet.

As Amy suffered from physical disabilities, and mental health problems, Ian would exploit this vulnerability, threatening that she would lose custody of the children if she were to leave him, or if she contacted support services, due to her disability.

In response to Ian’s abusive behaviour, Amy stated that she would ‘walk on egg-shells’ and would often take Dominique away from the house all day to ensure that Ian was not disturbed for fear of what he might do to her. During police investigations, both Amy and Ian disclosed several incidents that occurred in the week preceding the death which caused injury to Dominique although medical treatment was not sought. This included separate incidents of her ‘falling’ from Ian’s arms, and sustaining bruising and a puncture to the sole of her foot by unknown means.

On another occasion, Amy describes hearing Dominique cry and, upon investigation, Amy reported observing Ian hit Dominique hard on her back several times, causing the baby to scream inconsolably for over an hour despite efforts from Amy to calm her. Amy disclosed that she had wanted to take Dominique to the hospital as she believed Dominique was so badly injured she might die.

Ian refused repeated requests from Amy to take the victim child for medical attention.

Ian again refused to allow Amy to call emergency services, or anyone else, for assistance upon finding Dominique unresponsive, as he needed time to dispose of illicit substances he had in his possession.

He eventually allowed her to contact a family member to take the infant to a hospital, telling Amy what to say to the staff as a cover story, but by this time she had no pulse and was not breathing. Resuscitation attempts by the hospital were unsuccessful.”

Death Review and Advisory Board Annual Report 2016-17
5.1 Objective of supporting outcome one

The ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report identified the need to alter community attitudes to prevent domestic and family violence. In response, the Queensland Government’s Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy outlines a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence. As the example of Dominique demonstrates, there are a range of behaviours that comprise domestic and family violence, including use of harassment through technology facilitated abuse and controlling behaviours including social isolation, emotional abuse and physical violence. Supporting outcome one focuses on increasing knowledge and shifting attitudes to the breadth of behaviours that compromise domestic and family violence.

Supporting outcome one aims to contribute to foundational element one—significantly shifting community attitudes and behaviours towards domestic and family violence in Queensland. Research shows that an important determinant of the prevalence of domestic and family violence in a community is the attitudes of that community towards gender equality and domestic and family violence.\(^\text{19}\) Attitudes and stigmas can affect the willingness and ability of victim survivors and perpetrators to seek the appropriate support that they need, as well as greatly impact the protection of victim survivors by limiting the access, equity or fairness of the justice system.\(^\text{20}\)

The Second Action Plan outlines 21 individual actions to deliver on supporting outcome one. These actions align to 23 recommendations produced in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. The aim of these actions are:

- Everyone, everywhere feels safe, supported and protected from all forms of domestic and family violence.
- Family, friends and neighbours support each other. People concerned about or who suspect domestic and family violence are empowered to recognise, respond and refer appropriately. Friends, teammates, family and neighbours appropriately make it clear that violence is not acceptable and do not condone violent behaviour.
- First responders (police, ambulance, fire, health services) are able to recognise, respond and refer appropriately when violence occurs.

This chapter measures progress against the supporting outcome one by answering the five specific evaluation questions set out under the evaluation framework for the Strategy:

- To what extent have Queenslanders shown an improved understanding that all types of domestic and family violence are unacceptable?
- How effective has the Strategy been in informing victim survivors and perpetrators about where to go for help?
- How effective has the Strategy been in facilitating bystanders to take appropriate and safe action to prevent domestic and family violence?
- To what extent do Queenslanders demonstrate an understanding of the reason and need for cultural change when it comes to tackling domestic and family violence?
- To what extent has the Queensland community worked together to prevent domestic and family violence?\(^\text{21}\) – Addressed in supporting outcome three (see chapter 7)


These intermediate outcomes broadly align to the knowledge-attitudes-behaviour model (Figure 5.1). This model proposes that behaviour change can be influenced, over time, by knowledge. As this knowledge builds, it influences a person’s attitudes, and then ultimately, behaviour. In the context of this review, knowledge comprises of knowing the behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence and where to go for help. Attitudes relates to views on gender equality. Behaviours relates to shifts in bystander behaviour.

5.2 Knowledge on domestic and family violence

The KAB model shows that influencing behaviour occurs over the long-term. This explains why at this early stage of the Strategy, only changes in knowledge might be expected, while changes in attitudes and particularly behaviour are likely to occur in the long-term. However, adhering to this KAB model, any indications of changes in knowledge and/or awareness are assumed to be indications of potential future changes in behaviour.

**Figure 5.1 Knowledge-attitude-behaviour (KAB) model to behaviour change**

- To what extent have Queenslanders shown an improved understanding that all types of domestic and family violence are unacceptable?
- How effective has the Strategy been in informing victims and perpetrators about where to go for help?
- How effective has the Strategy been in facilitating bystanders to take appropriate and safe action to prevent domestic and family violence?
- To what extent do Queenslanders demonstrate an understanding of the reason and need for cultural change when it comes to tackling domestic and family violence?

Source: Baranowski et al. 2012

**Knowledge of domestic and family violence**

The QSS asks questions about a respondent’s level of agreement with a range of statements about whether certain behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence. Responses show that a large proportion of Queenslanders understand what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence. In 2018, up to 93% of Queenslanders understood and defined all six behaviours as domestic and family violence, responding with either; ‘yes, sometimes’, ‘yes, usually’, or ‘yes, always’, to each domestic and family violence behaviour (Chart 5.1).

The level of knowledge of what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence has been sustained over 2017 and 2018. However, the proportion of Queenslanders who consider the behaviours listed to 'yes, always' constitute domestic and family violence is considered to be the strongest indicator of the extent to which 'Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence'.

---

There are indications of slight declines over 2017 to 2018 in the estimated proportion of the Queensland population that consider the six identified behaviours always constitute domestic and family violence. The estimated proportion of the Queensland population that consider physical abuse to be ‘yes, always’ domestic and family violence experienced a statistically significant decline, from 82.8% in 2017 to 78.4% in 2018. For the other types of domestic and family violence the decline is not statistically-significant (Chart 5.1). This trend should be validated over time with greater research.

Differences are also observed when considering beliefs towards specific domestic and family violence behaviours in a single year. For example, in 2018, the estimated proportion of Queenslanders who consider financial control, harassment over electronic communications, and psychological and verbal abuse as ‘yes, always’ domestic and family violence is considerably lower than the estimated proportion of Queenslanders who consider intimidation and threats, sexual abuse and physical abuse as ‘yes, always’ domestic and family violence. This is supported by findings from the Death Review and Advisory Board (2016–17), which found fewer people consider social, emotional and psychological abuse constitutes domestic and family violence, and that there is a lack of detection and response of domestic and family violence where there was no association with direct physical violence. A recent White Paper by Marie Stopes Australia also identified another type of behaviour that can, depending on the situation, constitute domestic and family violence—reproductive coercion. This White Paper was developed in part due to identified low levels of knowledge and understanding of reproductive coercion in the context of domestic and family violence.23 This is an emerging area and should be monitored over time as awareness and understanding grows regarding this type of abuse.

Population groups such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, rural populations, people who identify as LGBTIQ, and people living with disability show relatively similar estimated levels of knowledge of all types of domestic and family violence (see Appendix A for more detail). The proportion of people from CALD backgrounds that demonstrated an understanding of the behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence was lower than the total and other population groups. In particular, the proportion of people from CALD backgrounds that showed an understanding of harassment and physical abuse was lower than those from non-CALD backgrounds. In contrast, older populations showed signs of a slightly higher understanding for non-physical behaviours constituting domestic and family violence, such as financial control and harassment. These results are consistent over 2017 and 2018 QSS estimations. However, they were not determined to be statistically significant and confidence intervals for people from CALD backgrounds in particular are large.

As was observed for the total population, there has been no change in domestic and family violence knowledge or attitudes over 2017 to 2018. However, there were indications of change occurring in some key demographic groups over that period. In particular, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and people from CALD backgrounds showed signs of increased knowledge of what comprises domestic and family violence and attitudes of most domestic and family violence categories, particularly non-physical forms of domestic and family violence. However, changes were not determined to be statistically significant and confidence intervals can be large. This trend should be validated over time with greater research.

Despite lower levels of understanding of certain non-physical forms of domestic and family violence, knowledge appears to be similar or greater than the nation as a whole. The ANROWS National Community Attitudes towards Violence against Women Survey (NCAS) has been conducted every four years since 2009. While it asks many of the QSS questions about understanding domestic and family violence, the sampling method means the two surveys are not directly comparable. Nonetheless, the similarity in the line of questioning suggests that Queenslanders may have similar or greater levels of knowledge about what constitutes domestic and family violence compared to the remainder of Australia (noting the methodological differences) (see Chart 5.2).
Lower levels of knowledge about certain types of domestic and family violence relative to others is also mirrored in respondents’ perceptions regarding the seriousness of these behaviours. In 2018, up to 90% of Queenslanders understood that all six domestic and family violence behaviours are serious issues, responding with one of either ‘very serious’ or ‘quite serious’, to each domestic and family violence category (Chart 5.3). This has remained unchanged from the 2017 QSS results across all six domestic and family violence categories.

However, Chart 5.3 also shows there are lower perceived levels of seriousness for certain types of domestic and family violence including verbal and psychological abuse, harassment over electronic communications and financial control compared to physical and sexual abuse and threats and intimidation. This gap in knowledge does not appear to have changed over 2017 to 2018. This is an indication that there are forms of domestic and family violence that may require a more targeted approach to increase understanding.

Source: ANROWS NCAS Survey 2017. Note: As the questions about financial control were slightly different in the two surveys, it was determined this could influence responses and were therefore not directly comparable. Therefore, it was excluded from this analysis.
Chart 5.3 The Queensland population’s understanding that certain domestic and family violence behaviours are serious, 2017 and 2018

Understanding psychological abuse and coercive behaviours as forms of domestic and family violence and their seriousness is also important in light of the 2017–18 annual report from the Death Review and Advisory Board. The report found high proportions of non-physical or sexual violence in the domestic and family violence related homicides that occurred between 2006–07 and 2017–18. While physical violence was the most commonly recorded form of domestic and family violence (42.1%) it was followed by psychological/emotional (28.6%), verbal (13.6%) and sexual (2.9%) domestic and family violence. Controlling behaviours were also present in 38.6% of cases where the type of violence was recorded. The 2016–17 annual report found technology facilitated abuse and harassment via text, email and social media an emerging trend in the cases reviewed. Despite this, the report concludes that the perceptions of the seriousness of technology facilitated abuse and its effect ‘is lagging behind’.26

There appears to be a gap between knowledge of what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence and the seriousness of this behaviour. Chart 5.4 displays the estimated percentage of adult Queensland residents in 2018 who consider each form of domestic and family violence behaviour as ‘yes, always’ domestic and family violence, in comparison to the proportion of the Queensland population who report these as ‘very, serious’. The comparison shows that, across all forms of domestic and family violence, there are some differences in the estimated proportion of Queenslanders in each category. This gap was highest for the domestic and family violence behaviours of psychological abuse, physical abuse and harassment. These results indicate that for a small proportion of the population, there is a gap between attitudes and knowledge that has not yet been addressed by the Strategy.

Chart 5.4 The estimated proportion of the Queensland population who consider each behaviour as ‘yes, always’ domestic and family violence, compared to those that consider each behaviour as ‘very serious’, 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics estimations using Queensland Social Survey 2017 and 2018 data

**Knowing where to get help**

The Queensland Government’s domestic and family violence strategy aims to contribute to the knowledge of where to get help through an extensive communication strategy, which includes a help-seeking campaign; ongoing since 2016. This section reports DVConnect clients and Kids Helpline calls related to domestic and family violence as proxy indicators of changes in help-seeking behaviour during the Strategy. In doing so, it should be noted that it cannot be determined from this data how many did not seek help due to domestic and family violence.

DVConnect is an important source of support and help for victim survivors, perpetrators and people concerned about or who suspect domestic and family violence. Analysing the number of DVConnect clients is an indicator of the degree to which Queenslanders are reaching out for support, noting this is just one avenue of help seeking behaviour.27

---

27 DVConnect defines a ‘client’ as someone who receives some form of intervention and complete intake information is collected from them. DVConnect receives many more calls than those who eventuate into clients. If there is a break in engagement, they become a new client and are therefore counted again.
Calls for domestic and family violence support/advice/help to women's and men's lines declined from 108,543 in 2015–16 to 93,411 in 2017–18. However, DVConnect clients have risen from 36,872 to 39,847 (Chart 5.5). Growth in clients has largely been driven by Womensline clients, which has increased by 20% from 2015–16 to 2017–18. Growth in Womensline clients was driven by self-referrals, which accounted for 95% of all Womensline clients in 2017-18. Mensline clients declined by 15.8% over 2015–16 to 2017–18. The decline is the result of a reduction in perpetrators self-initiated contact since 2015–16, which fell five percentage points from 2015–16 to 2017–18. This decline has been partly offset by police referrals, which has increased by half a percentage point relative to all callers from 2015–16 to 2017–18.

Data provided by CSYW.

A police referral is when police organise an external service provider such as DVConnect to contact an at-risk or vulnerable community member.
The number and proportion of DVConnect clients who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people or from CALD backgrounds, is increasing (see Chart 5.6).

Chart 5.6 DVConnect clients for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and CALD backgrounds, 2015–16 to 2017–18

Source: Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women, DVConnect data

Between 2015–16 and 2016–17 the number of DVConnect clients increased across all regions, with the exception of South East Queensland (Chart 5.7). Consultations with rural and regional implementation workers anecdotally reported that in some communities victim survivors and perpetrators did not know what services were available, how to access services and who to contact. To overcome this barrier, one region is hosting quarterly engagement events in a local park, for local community members, agencies and non-government services to share information regarding services in the area. During consultation it was also highlighted that people with disability and older people were not reporting incidents of domestic and family violence, potentially attributable to a lack of knowledge regarding reporting processes and services available.
There is some evidence that children exposed to family violence are willing to access help. In 2017, there were 1,038 calls to Kids Helpline flagging domestic and family violence concerns from Queensland residents aged under 25. This accounted for 8.7% of concerns raised from Queenslanders through the Kids Helpline during 2017. Most of these concerns were due to physical, sexual or emotional domestic and family violence from a family member, while approximately 14% of domestic and family violence related concerns raised were concerns with a young person’s exposure to domestic and family violence.

Since 2015, domestic and family violence concerns raised by Queenslanders under the age of 25 to the Kids Helpline have increased slightly from 8.2% to 8.7% as a percentage of concerns raised. Most of this growth is due to calls about emotional abuse and exposure to domestic and family violence, with the latter increasing from 99 concerns in 2015 to 144 concerns in 2017.

5.3 Attitudes

Another measure of the degree to which knowledge, attitudes and behaviours towards domestic and family violence are changing is the degree to which Queenslanders acknowledge and understand that gender inequality is the main driver of domestic and family violence.

There is no specific publicly available measure that allows for an estimate of the degree to which the Queensland population understands the role of gender inequality in the context of domestic and family violence. However, Question 23c of the QSS is used as a proxy indicator in lieu of a more accurate and robust measure. Question 23c asks participants to respond with the degree to which they agree or disagree with the statement; ‘It is important that our culture respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’. The results for the Queensland population and a number of demographic groups are shown in Chart 5.8 below.

---

Chart 5.8 Queensland population views of the importance of a culture that respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes – response rates of ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’, 2017 and 2018

The results show that more than 76.5% of Queenslanders value the importance of a culture that ‘respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’. This is fairly consistent across demographic groups, with people from CALD backgrounds representing the highest proportion of agreement in 2017 and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people the highest proportion of agreement in 2018. However, these results are not statistically significant, and have larger confidence intervals.

There has been a statistically significant decline in the proportion of the Queensland population that ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to the statement posed in Q23c of the QSS over 2017 to 2018. This declining trend is consistent across all demographic groups except for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, where there has been a slight increase in response rates of agreement to the statement. However, the movements in demographic groups is not statistically significant.

It is unclear why this declining trend is occurring, and caution is required in interpretation for demographic groups due to large confidence intervals. Any estimations of the view of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people should be treated with caution based on the extent to which the QSS accurately reflects the views of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and the representativeness of the sample, particularly in remote areas.

Source: Queensland Social Survey 2017 and 2018
5.4 Behaviour – bystanders take appropriate action

Victim survivors may not always be able to seek support themselves. Empowering those who are concerned or suspect domestic and family violence is vital in enabling support to reach those who need it. Research shows that bystanders face their own challenges in taking action.\(^{31}\)

To create an environment in which bystanders feel comfortable, the Queensland Government has embarked on a bystander communication strategy with the aim of making ‘all adult Queenslanders active bystanders in the case of domestic and family violence’.

The bystander campaign evaluation shows some improvements in the awareness and self-related capability of those exposed to the campaign.\(^{32}\) It is important to note that the influence of bystander behaviour change is the culmination of activities from across the strategy, the bystander campaign is just one aspect of influence. Those who were reached by the campaign felt the government was there to support them to intervene, and felt more confident in their capacity to offer the right type of help for someone experiencing domestic and family violence.

**Intended bystander behaviour**

Bystanders’ willingness to get involved, and the nature of their involvement, is influenced by the type of domestic and family violence behaviours they are witness to and their relationship with the victim survivor or perpetrator.

Bystanders are more willing to become involved in physical rather than non-physical domestic and family violence. This is supported by QSS results, which measures the Queensland population’s willingness to intervene for physical and non-physical domestic and family violence involving a neighbour. In 2018, QSS found that 23.8% of the Queensland population suggested that they would not do anything in non-physical domestic and family violence involving a neighbour (Chart 5.9b), compared to 4.3% with regards to physical domestic and family violence (Chart 5.9a).

**Chart 5.9 Bystander willingness to intervene in domestic and family violence involving a neighbour, 2017 to 2018**

a) Physical domestic and family violence


Revealed bystander behaviour

While there is no direct metric to measure the improvement in domestic and family violence awareness of bystanders, Q20a of the QSS asks: 'In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any domestic and family violence involving a family member or close friend?'. Questions 21a and 22a pose the same question about domestic and family violence involving a neighbour (Q21a) and involving people the respondent doesn’t know (Q22a).

The results are displayed in Chart 5.10, and show that up to 25.2% of Queenslanders became aware of domestic and family violence involving a stranger, 16.5% of Queenslanders were aware of domestic and family violence involving a family member/close friend, and 11.5% involving a neighbour in the 12 months prior to the survey. There was no change between 2017 and 2018. These results indicate that more than 25% of Queenslanders were bystanders in 2018.
People are also more likely to intervene if they have a closer relationship with the victim survivor or perpetrator. While Chart 5.10 shows intention to intervene, Chart 5.11 shows an estimation of how the Queensland population that was concerned about or suspected domestic and family violence over a 12-month period, actually intervened. QSS results show that approximately 19% of the Queensland population aware of domestic and family violence involving a family member or close friend did not intervene in 2018 (Chart 5.11). This increased to approximately 40% of Queenslanders aware of domestic and family violence involving a neighbour, and approximately 61% of Queenslanders aware of domestic and family violence involving 'other people'.

The QSS results indicate that most Queenslanders did intervene in some capacity once aware of domestic and family violence involving a neighbour, close friend or family member, however, how they intervened is dependent on the relationship between the bystander and the victim survivor or perpetrator. More specifically, Queenslanders are most likely to talk to the victim/perpetrator if domestic and family violence involves a family member and call police if it involves a neighbour. However, when the relationship with the victim survivor or perpetrator appeared to be more limited (categorised as 'other person' in QSS), Queensland bystanders were more likely to 'do nothing'. It is important to note that this data may not be an accurate measure of intended bystander behaviour as there is no option for the survey participant to indicate if domestic and family violence was being attended to by another party i.e. the police.
Chart 5.11 Bystander behaviour when confronted with domestic and family violence involving a family or friend, neighbour or another person, 2017 to 2018

Source: Queensland Social Survey 2017 and 2018. Note - as multiple responses are allowed this does not sum to 100%

QSS findings should also be contextualised in terms of people’s uncertainty and confidence in how to appropriately respond to domestic and family violence. Enhance Research\(^{33}\) found that people were unsure about appropriate intervention options available to them, and had mixed levels of confidence. In a 2017 survey of 1,486 Queensland residents, Enhance Research found that less than half of respondents agreed they felt confident in ‘being able to offer the right kind of help to someone experiencing domestic and family violence’. However, 74% of respondents agreed they were confident in ‘being able to find a person or service that could help’. While these survey results may not be directly relatable to the QSS results due to differences in sampling and survey methodology, they do offer insights into the barriers inhibiting bystander interventions.

Campaign post-evaluation research by Enhance Research found that the bystander campaign was having some of the desired impacts that it was intended to have in those that were exposed to the campaign. The research found that 67% of survey participants exposed to the campaign had a greater self-reported awareness of their personal role in preventing domestic and family violence. Sixty five per cent of people who recall seeing the campaign felt the campaign gave them permission by the Government to intervene, while 42% felt that they would feel more comfortable calling police as a result of seeing the campaign. It is important to note that these survey results are not representative of the impacts of the campaign on the entire Queensland population. Rather, these results should be treated as indicators that there are some improvements in bystander awareness and attitudes as a result of the campaign in some segments of the population.\(^{34}\)


\(^{34}\) Ibid.
Overall, population groups such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, rural populations, people who identify as LGBTIQ, and people with disability show relatively similar levels of their estimated willingness to intervene in physical domestic and family violence. There has been no statistically significant change from 2017–2018 for all demographic groups.

There are variations in the willingness of these population groups to get involved in non-physical domestic and family violence. Older people reported being statistically less likely to get involved in domestic and family violence involving a neighbour. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people who identify as LGBTIQ and people from CALD backgrounds showed signs of a greater willingness to get involved in non-physical disputes. However, the differences in the latter group were not considered statistically significant.

5.5 Third party intervention for children

While the data on interventions in domestic and family violence involving children is scant, analysis of child protection notifications data provides some indications of the capability of Queenslanders and social services to identify children at risk, or victim survivors of domestic and family violence.

Child abuse and child protection orders intersect with domestic and family violence where it occurs by parents or guardians. Child protection services are received by people under the age of 18 who have been, or are at risk of being abused, neglected, or otherwise harmed, or whose parents are unable to provide adequate care or protection.35 Once child protection orders are substantiated, they are categorised as: physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, or neglect. Aligning with the reasoning of the AIHW in its report titled ‘Family, domestic and sexual violence in Australia 2018’36, all four abuse categories are deemed in-scope of this report as they represent a situation where a child is placed in harm’s way within a domestic situation.

The Queensland Government has instituted a number of policy responses in response to child protection. These include the Supporting Families Changing Futures reform program, the Our Way Strategy and Action Plan and the Queensland Government Response to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

A notification to child protection is a submission of concern for a child’s safety and wellbeing within their current domestic situation by a third party to the government. Chart 5.12 shows the number of notifications per 1,000 children aged under 17 for Queensland and Australia from 2012–13 to 2016–17. As of 2016–17, there were approximately 19.7 notifications per 1,000 Queensland children aged under 17. This was the lowest notification rate of all Australian states, with the national average more than three times as high.37 There has been a decline in the number of notifications of child abuse in Queensland, which is in contrast to the national trend. Queensland and Western Australia are the only states to record a decline in child protection notifications over this period. This should be treated cautiously—on one hand it could mean a reduction in the number of cases or it could mean fewer people are inclined to report cases of child abuse.

---

36 Ibid.
37 Comparing child protection data across states should be treated with caution due to the differences in definitions of child abuse, as well as the different mechanisms for recording a notification in place. However, comparison of notification rates across states, over time, provides a useful way of analysing trends.
Chart 5.12 Number of child protection notifications per 1,000 children; Queensland and Australia, 2012–13 to 2016–17

6  Supporting outcome two

Are respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour embedded in our community?

Key findings

The QSS shows that 76.4% of Queenslanders strongly agree or agree with the statement: ‘it is important our culture respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’. This has declined from 82.3% in 2017, and is a statistically significant change. Nine percent disagree or strongly disagree with this statement, 13.7% neither agree nor disagree. There is room for improvement.

In May-June 2018, 368 of 1,240 Queensland state schools reported they were implementing the DoE’s RRE program. This figure has increased from 267 in 2017. Based on data collated by DoE from the 2018 School Annual Reports, the vast majority of Queensland state schools reported to have implemented RRE. In the context of the school community, delivery of respectful relationships education draws from a variety of resources, one of which is the DoE’s RREP which is focussed specifically on influencing behaviour change in an effort to prevent issues such as domestic and family violence. Other resources or programs available to schools in implementing respectful relationships education may also encompass components that challenge attitudes about violence and gender construction known to lead to violence, alongside components addressing a broader range of complex social and emotional issues relevant to children and young people such as mental health, personal safety and protective behaviours.

Other progress includes an evaluation of the Our Watch whole-of-school approach to respectful relationships education pilot, which is underway, analysis from that evaluation will inform progress under this supporting outcome.

It is too early to tell whether cultural change has occurred. Initiatives have focused on increasing knowledge of behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence and awareness of services available. Cultural change is expected to take time, and the focus to date has been on raising knowledge and awareness through government-led initiatives such as the communications campaign and workplace reforms. There is evidence in supporting outcomes three and four that education on respectful relationships and gender equality is occurring across workplaces and community organisations. It is important to continue this work and track culture change in the long term.

Note: The method of collecting data on uptake of RRE and RREP in 2017 was different to 2018, and therefore any comparison should be interpreted with caution.

This section refers to three related but distinct initiatives:

- **Respectful relationships (RRE)** – is a broad term to describe a holistic approach to the primary prevention of domestic and family violence and gender-based violence. RRE focuses on preventing the underlying drivers of domestic and family violence and gender-based violence.

- **Respectful relationships education program (RREP)** – In 2016, the DoE developed the RREP in response to The Taskforce report and recommendations. The RREP is a Prep to Year 12 program and is aligned to the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (HPE). It is available to all Queensland schools via appropriate online platforms.
Our Watch pilot – In 2017, DoE partnered with Our Watch to pilot a whole-school approach to RRE in 10 Queensland state primary schools. The focus of the pilot is on implementing and evaluating a whole-school approach to RRE. It involves professional development for staff, auditing current policies and processes, engaging parents to reinforce messages received at school about respect and equality and 10 hours of curriculum instruction for students in Years 1 and 2.
“I learned so much about myself ... Just everything I believe in was pretty much wrong. What I thought men were, what we believe that we are, or, with the changing society, sort of thing, it’s all different to what I thought it was... it’s mind-blowing ... I’m learning to change [my beliefs].”

-Perpetrator from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial. Griffith University
6.1 Objectives of supporting outcome two

As the quote on the previous page indicates, understanding gender roles and respectful relationships is essential to changing perpetrator behaviour. Commencing education early, rather than as a response, is essential for family violence prevention. Embedding respectful relationships in Queensland communities is a key element of the Queensland Government’s Strategy for long-term change.

Supporting outcome two aims to contribute to foundational element one: significantly shifting community attitudes and behaviours towards domestic and family violence in Queensland. It comprises two components – promoting RRE and whole of awareness raising within the Queensland community. This is reflected in the five specific evaluation questions for intermediate outcomes that contribute to this supporting outcome: 38

- To what extent has the school community shown an improved understanding of the importance of respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour?
- To what extent has there been an increase in the capacity of schools to implement RRE?
- Is there an increased awareness within the school community of the value of RRE?
- To what extent do students have improved understanding of and skills in respectful relationships?
- To what extent has the broader community supported programs aimed at increasing gender equality, respectful relationships and non-violence across community, workplaces and education?

6.1.1 Respectful relationships education

The development of the Queensland DoE's RREP stems from recommendations 24-26 of the 'Not Now, Not Ever' Report. Recommendation 24 supports the introduction of programs in all primary and secondary Queensland state schools, to embed a culture that emphasises:

- developing and maintaining respectful relationships;
- respecting self; and
- gender equality.

The DoE completed recommendations 24-27 from the 'Not Now, Not Ever' Report in December 2016. In the Second Action Plan, the DoE has continued to review and promote the Department's RREP and provide principals with other evidence informed approaches to RRE.

The RREP is a primary prevention program focused on influencing behaviour change among children and young people, aimed at embedding a culture of respect, which contributes to the prevention of domestic and family violence.39 By implementing education programs grounded in respectful relationship principles, schools will give students opportunities for social and emotional learning.40

This approach has aligned the RREP with the Australian Health and Physical Education curriculum. The RREP is referenced in other material, such as the P-12 CARF, Student Learning and Wellbeing Framework and Student Learning and Wellbeing Framework Reflection and Implementation Tool. This promotes a whole-of-school approach to implementing the program. As referenced in the case study (Appendix F), embedding RRE in the curriculum is an enabler, as it endorses the allocation of time within a busy curriculum to RRE.41 Some schools however may implement RRE using external RRE resources and programs.

A survey distributed to Queensland state schools in November 2017 asked whether they were delivering RRE and if it was the DoE’s program. Of the 851 responses, 452 schools reported they

39 Primary prevention strategies for domestic and family violence seek to remove the causes of violence, prevent risk factors associated with the violence and enhance protective factors against the violence.
40 Which includes the attributes of: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationships, ethics, values, social norms, stereotypes, human rights, risk and responsible decision-making.
were delivering RRE. Based on data collated by DoE from the 2018 School Annual Reports\(^{42}\), the vast majority of Queensland state schools reported to have implemented RRE. In the context of the school community, delivery of respectful relationships education draws from a variety of resources, one of which is the DoE's RREP which is focussed specifically on influencing behaviour change in an effort to prevent issues such as domestic and family violence. Other resources or programs available to schools in implementing respectful relationships education may also encompass components that challenge attitudes about violence and gender construction known to lead to violence, alongside components addressing a broader range of complex social and emotional issues relevant to children and young people such as mental health, personal safety and protective behaviours.

In 2017, 59% of the schools who reported delivering RRE also reported this included RREP, demonstrating this is an important resource that schools across Queensland rely upon as part of their RRE. \(^{43}\) When considering the total number of state schools in Queensland, there has been a reported increase in uptake of the DoE's RREP between 2017 and 2018. In 2018, 368 schools (29.7% of the 1,240 state schools) reported they were using the RREP, compared to 267 schools (21.5% of 1,239 state schools) the previous year. \(^{44}\)

A consistent theme in terms of enablers for implementing this supporting outcome is leadership, both within the DoE and schools (see case study Appendix F). This included school principals recognising both the problem of domestic and family violence in society and, in some cases, their school community, as well as the important role of RRE as a form of primary prevention. These provide the conditions under which school leaders choose to prioritise RRE within their school. This foundational level of understanding and commitment encourages buy-in across the school community (other teachers and parents), prioritises time within the school to teach RRE, and aligns other features of the school with RRE such as approaches to student leadership and school values.

During the consultation for this evaluation, one of the consistent barriers to include RRE is the need to balance competing priorities and core business in a busy school environment. This includes dedicating sufficient time in the core curriculum with the increased focus on school results such as NAPLAN, in addition to other initiatives available for wellbeing including across mental health and RRE, and other reforms.

In response to the intermediate outcomes related to schools, an evaluation of the Our Watch pilot in 10 schools is underway, with data relevant to informing analysis of intermediate outcomes being collected. As the review is yet to conclude, analysis herein includes general progress to date.\(^{45,46}\)

Data on the number of visits to the RREP website shows an increase in access during awareness raising months. For example, there were 8,882 visits to the website in November 2017, which coincides with White Ribbon Day. May 2018 had the highest number of website visits, which coincided with DoE promoting Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, including through webinars.

Other progress against the supporting outcome includes:

- White Ribbon Breaking the Silence Schools program (30 state schools as at December 2018
- Pilot of Our Watch in 10 primary schools (see case study Appendix F).

\(^{42}\) Note that the method of collecting data on uptake of RRE and RREP in 2017 was different to 2018, and therefore any comparison should be interpreted with caution.

\(^{43}\) Information provided by the Department of Education 18 July 2019.

\(^{44}\) Information provided by the Department of Education 18 July 2019.


6.1.2 The broader community values respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour

Promoting respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour extends beyond the school classroom and RRE, and into workplaces and communities. Research by Our Watch’s Change the Story report found four drivers of domestic and family violence:

- **Challenging** condoning of violence (focus to date especially through supporting outcome one)
- **Strengthening** positive, equal and respectful relationships (focus to date through supporting outcome two)
- **Promoting** women’s independence and decision-making
- **Challenging** gender stereotypes and roles.\(^\text{47}\)

---

These demonstrate that a community’s views on gender equality and the gender-defined roles of a society is a major contributor of domestic and family violence. An important element of decreasing the prevalence of domestic and family violence, therefore, relates to the ability of society to challenge gender stereotypes and roles. Achieving the goal of a Queensland free from domestic and family violence will take time and depends on a significant shift in Queenslanders’ attitudes and beliefs regarding acceptable social norms and gender equality.

Data from the QSS suggests further work is required to challenge prevailing gender roles and promote a culture of gender equality. QSS data shows that the proportion of the Queensland population that ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ with the statement: ‘it is important that our culture respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’ has declined from 82.3% to 76.4% over 2017 to 2018. This change is statistically significant. While it is estimated that 9.0% of the population ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ with the statement, a further 13.7% ‘neither disagree or agree’.

It is estimated that 58.3% of Queenslanders ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ with the statement ‘Women prefer a man to be in charge of a relationship’ (Chart 6.1). This has seen a statistically significant decline from 63.3% in 2017. It is estimated that 11.7% ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ as well as 29.7% ‘neither agree nor disagree’ with this statement. This demonstrates there is more progress to be made before Queenslanders believe gender equality within relationships is desired by women and before the concept of respectful relationships based on gender equality and non-violent behaviour becomes embedded within communities.

![Chart 6.1 Agreement of the Queensland population with the statement: 'Women prefer a man to be in charge of a relationship', 2017 to 2018](https://www.anrows.org.au/research-program/ncas)

Progress has been made in implementing actions that provide the foundational elements for creating cultural change over time. Examples include changing public sector workforce awareness of and attitudes to domestic and family violence and the communications and engagement strategy.

As discussed in chapter 8, public sector workforces have also worked to change culture from within their organisation through training, WRA and domestic and family violence policies. Similarly, this is aimed at increasing knowledge of domestic and family violence and communicating the message that domestic and family violence is never okay. This is discussed further in supporting outcome four.

---

The communications strategy comprised five key messages, of which two particularly relate to cultural change (the others are more around help-seeking). These are:

- ‘Domestic and family violence is unacceptable’, and
- ‘Domestic and family violence is not just physical – it comes in many forms’.

Future phases of communications may wish to consider whether promoting respectful relationships and positive perceptions towards gender equality (as per the evaluation framework) warrants future attention, given these serve as important features of family violence prevention.\(^49\) This could complement work already undertaken by the Commonwealth Government and Council of Australia Governments, for example The Stop It at The Start campaign, which helped to break the cycle of violence by encouraging adults to reflect on their attitudes and to have conversations about respect with young people.

7 Supporting outcome three

To what extent are Queensland community, business, religious, sporting, and all government leaders taking action and working together?

Key Findings

Approximately 7.6% of Queenslanders are involved in community domestic and family violence prevention initiatives.

There were 75 registered events for domestic and family violence prevention month in 2017-18. In addition, there were 35 successful grant recipients of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month Grant program – 13 of which were specifically targeting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Events funded typically received a higher dollar value and attracted more participants than in previous years, particularly in regional locations.

There are pockets of initiatives being led by community that demonstrate leadership and commitment to preventing domestic and family violence. These are occurring across sectors. Leadership and collaboration have been identified as important enablers to success. Scaling of initiatives will be important; so that ownership can be localised and embedded across Queensland communities. Government plays an important role in facilitating action among businesses, local government and community organisations by providing a trusted and authoritative source of information to change policies, challenge attitudes and promote awareness.

Embedded officers are a mechanism through which organisations are sharing knowledge and resources. Across sectors, an approach that has been adopted to facilitate resource and knowledge sharing has been to embed a specialist officer in another service. An example where this has been achieved is the DEAT, this has seen early evidence of success in improving outcomes for clients, facilitating better service responses, and enhancing a referral process. Other approaches include place-based approaches, partnerships and co-design approaches. The ways of working together flow from informal to more formal arrangements such as the embedded officer model.
“We are very thankful and grateful for all of the help when we had nothing. I didn’t think I would be able to give the boys anything for their birthdays because of everything that has gone on and I just didn’t have the money. We had nothing. I could not believe what we got, it was such an awesome surprise and we will forever be thankful.”

- Mother of family engaged with a domestic and family violence service provider who received birthday packs prepared by staff from the business Strategenics. This was a result of a partnership between Strategenics and the service provider as part of Australia’s CEO Challenge. DFVI Council Progress Report 2017-18
7.1 Objectives of supporting outcome three
The objective of actions in the Second Action Plan under supporting outcome three is to facilitate community-led activity and engagement on domestic and family violence at a local level. This includes forming networks across organisations to share supports, resources and ideas.

There are 12 actions within supporting outcome three, four are key initiatives.

The following evaluation questions for intermediate outcomes drive the evaluation of whether the actions as part of the Second Action Plan are meeting the objectives of supporting outcome three:

- To what extent has the Queensland community been working together to protect and support victim survivors and model respectful relationships? This includes the intermediate outcome that cultural change is led by communities across Queensland, working together to protect and support victim survivors and model respectful relationships?
- How effective are the networks between and across communities and organisations in enabling the sharing of supports, resources and ideas?
- Has the Strategy helped promote cultural change in the broader Queensland community?

7.2 Progress to date
According to the QSS, approximately 7.6% of Queenslanders have been involved in community domestic and family violence related initiatives over the past 12 months (see Chart 7.1). This is a slight decline from the previous year. Of the attended domestic and family violence initiatives, 62.5% were managed by communities, 25.4% by business, 15.6% by religious organisations and 9.8% by sports organisations. There is limited data to understand the extent to which sporting clubs and religious organisations are contributing to domestic and family violence prevention initiatives, though these are presumably covered within the ‘community managed’ section of the QSS data, displayed in Chart 7.1.

While not statistically significant, there has been a decline between 2017 and 2018 in the proportion of Queenslanders from vulnerable population groups who are involved in domestic and family violence initiatives, with the exception of regional and remote communities. For example, people from CALD backgrounds and people who identify as LGBTIQ were more likely than the general population to participate in a domestic and family violence initiative in 2017 but not as likely to do so in 2018.

The voices of victim survivors
“Schools play such an important role in identifying and responding to domestic violence... they picked up there was an issue before I’d even spoke to any family or friends about it. When I was finally ready to leave, the school, child safety and QPS worked together to make sure the children and I were safe.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.

51 Sporting clubs and religious organisations were identified in the Not Now Not Ever Report as important organisations to involve in raising awareness throughout Queensland communities.
There are several awareness raising activities delivered by funded domestic and family violence services and grant programs, including the Women’s Week grants and the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month (DFVPM) grants. Recognising the DFVPM grants are just one vehicle for community-driven action to raise awareness on domestic and family violence, Chart 7.2 shows official community initiative grant applications for domestic and family violence support events held during domestic and family violence prevention month. Chart 7.2a shows a decline in the proportion of successful grant applications since 2015–16, and an increase in the average value per successful grant over the same period. There are also fewer events occurring each year—from 57 in 2015–16 to 42 in 2016–17 and 35 in 2017–18. Chart 7.2b shows a 26.1% increase in the number of participants in events in SEQ, and a 48.1% increase in the number of participants in events in regional and rural locations across Queensland. These findings suggest that while there has been a decline in the number of grant applications awarded, successful events typically receive a higher dollar value, and attracted more participants in 2017–18 than in 2016–17. This appears particularly true in regional locations across Queensland. These improvements suggest increased community engagement in domestic and family violence prevention for the events delivered.

Chart 7.2 shows there has been a 42.8% decrease in grants provided to SEQ and a 21.1% increase in grants provided in regional and rural areas.
Community-led initiatives complement the work already being delivered by existing organisations, enhancing awareness of domestic and family violence. Consultations raised examples of culturally appropriate community initiatives being driven by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. For example, a local sewing group that provides support to women through social connection.

The absence of systematic data collection means it is difficult to capture the full scale of community-led initiatives being delivered across Queensland. The case studies and DFVPM data show that there are diverse community initiatives occurring. For example, private developers Halcyon and Mirvac worked with DVConnect to deliver Queensland’s first purpose-built bridging accommodation for domestic and family violence in 2018, which filled a service gap in the region, as well as offering stable housing options. There are also examples of sporting clubs taking the lead in educating members as well as raising awareness in the community. This is exemplified by the Maroochydore Roos AFL club participating in the #notinmyclub domestic and family violence educational initiative—a joint initiative with White Ribbon Australia, and printing the anti-domestic and family violence message #makeitstop on their club jerseys and team polo shirts to raise awareness.

Community-led initiatives are largely initiated by leaders within a community who perceive domestic and family violence as an important issue. As the Strategy continues to develop, the focus could be on how to spread and scale community-led initiatives across Queensland. This raises two key questions for consideration:

- How can the Queensland Government draw on what has worked to date for community-led initiatives to encourage communities, religious organisations, businesses and sporting groups to take up initiatives?
- Should the Queensland Government encourage community-led initiatives in areas where there is the greatest need, or allow these to occur organically? This is important to overcome selection bias—where communities without strong leadership and awareness of domestic and family violence may have the greatest need for initiatives, yet limited capability to implement such activities.
7.2.2 Enablers of community-led initiatives and ways of working together

The consultations and case studies identified several enablers of community-led initiatives and ways of working together ranging from informal to more formal arrangements, including the role of leadership, partnerships, place-based approaches and co-design.

Nancarrow and Viljoen (2011) developed a ‘cooperation continuum’, from autonomy to integration. These range in terms of their level of formality—from informal sharing of knowledge to more formal arrangements, as shown in Figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1 The co-operation – integration continuum


The role of leadership to initiate, create support for, and drive domestic and family violence prevention initiatives in communities was a consistent theme raised across sectors during consultations and case studies. For example, the Mackay and the DoE case studies identified that action was initiated due to local government leaders and school leaders understanding that domestic and family violence was affecting their local community and wanting to take action against it. In both examples, they used their position within their communities to communicate the need and seek buy-in and support from others to drive initiatives and change. The DCSYW noted businesses can act as leaders within their industry, drawing on their informal networks to inform why they are taking a leading position in responding to domestic and family violence. The Mackay case study provided insights into how leaders can be encouraged to drive responses to domestic and family violence. This includes having a recognised leader (in the example Quentin Bryce and Rosie Batty) raise the profile of domestic and family violence and making the topic relevant to leaders through personalised stories or local data.

Another mechanism that has worked well has been partnerships with businesses, sporting organisations and communities to drive government-led initiatives. For example, the communications case study (Appendix G) found that partnerships to deliver campaign messages has worked well. A number of official partners have embraced the campaigns including Queensland Rail, Gold Coast Suns, Brisbane Lions, Queensland Police, Brisbane City Council and the Heritage Bank. Their support of the campaign has manifested in a number of different initiatives that are not all

tracked by implementing partners, and have included opportunities for high exposure and reach. Encouraging and pursuing partnerships with community organisations and businesses increases the reach and delivery of messages through different means. The delivery of messages can also be tailored, making it more relevant to an audience.

Another theme emerging from examples of community initiatives is the concept of place-based approaches. This refers to local areas adopting initiatives that are specifically tailored to that community’s needs. For example, in Mackay, the local Mayor is leading changes within the community, connecting local government, local businesses and domestic and family violence services through establishing a local taskforce. This has enabled members of the Mackay taskforce to initiate change within their own organisations, while also working together to promote change within the Mackay community. Examples of this include an Awareness Leadership Forum in May 2017 and a community campaign ‘Draw the Line’ to promote ending domestic and family violence.

Another example of a place-based approach, combined with a collaborative approach, is the Community Advisory Group established in Cherbourg. This group comprises members of the community (residents and Elders) to provide advice and information to the HRT and ISR groups as well as at a local governance level. While not involved in case discussions as part of the HRT due to confidentiality issues, the group is a cross section of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and is a key component of the ISR in Cherbourg, particularly in addressing the cultural needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

There are many advantages of place-based approaches; they enable communities to develop a response that is customised to their local context and need, ensuring the response is more tailored. For example, in Mackay it was identified that the local service provider required a child counsellor. This role was subsequently funded through the 2019 Lord Mayor’s Ball. Targeting resources to areas of greatest need contributes to efficient and effective service delivery. In contrast, there is a risk that place-based approaches may contribute, including unintentionally, to inequality and inconsistency. Inequality could stem both within communities (i.e. who is targeted within the community) and between communities. For example, the Mackay Regional Council noted they are a large local council with more resources they can dedicate to responding to domestic and family violence, relative to other smaller regional councils. It is important to provide an opportunity for learnings about what is working to be shared across places, to avoid becoming siloed.

An iterative co-design process was a key feature of the ISR trials. There are many benefits derived from co-designing service responses. A key component of co-design is that the users—in this context, communities—are engaged in the design process as ‘experts’ of their own experience, becoming a crucial central component of the design process. Consultations have highlighted that benefits are being derived from co-design processes through increased collaboration between the community, government agencies and the service sector, increased sharing of resources and information specifically relating to cultural and geographical challenges.

In the implementation evaluation phase of the ISR trials, co-design was identified as a key enabling factor. This includes establishing governance structures to bring the relevant organisations within the community together to input into the design of the service. In terms of governance and co-design, each site is guided by different groups and committees, while also receiving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, CALD and community reference groups. For example, the governance structure for Cherbourg consists of the Multi Agency Governance Group and the Cherbourg community, mutually providing guidance for the HRT. In Logan-Beenleigh and Mount Isa, integration managers, representatives from universal and secondary services, as well as government agencies came together to share information and education to inform the design and continuation of the trials. In Cherbourg, the integration manager played a critical role in the establishment and early implementation of the HRT. Along with extra support staff from DCSYW regional office and DATSIP,

the integration manager focused on engagement, co-design and co-management with the community.\textsuperscript{55}

The work of the Court Innovation Program to support Community Justice Groups (CJG) is another example of using co-design approaches to support design of place-based solutions. Support is being provided to help the CJGs facilitate engagement of local stakeholders to collaboratively identify needs, design and implement solutions, tailored to local culture, context and circumstance.

Some services are embedding specialist personnel in other organisations to facilitate collaboration and to share knowledge and provide support. This approach was commonly referred to in stakeholder consultations, and is a theme across several case studies. For instance the DEAT model has enabled the sharing of information between agencies and among the service sector (such as residential aged care facilities and disability service providers), diffusing information such as referral processes. Within the QH case study, some providers reported embedding a specialist domestic and family violence worker in the health service to assist with capability building and warm referrals.

### 7.3 Role for Government

Through consultations, it was identified that Government can play an important role in facilitating action among businesses, local government and community organisations. The main role government can play is providing a trusted and authoritative source of information and facilitating connections between organisations. For example, providing details of support that businesses can offer, or accurate information on what to do if people disclose experiencing domestic and family violence. The former can be important given the lack of connection businesses may have with the service sector.

The Queensland Government has sought to influence non-government workplaces through the Workplace Package (resources available to businesses and NGOs via the website), developing the RRR in collaboration with DCSYW and Australia’s CEO Challenge and promoting this to local government, businesses and NGOs and leading a Queensland Business Roundtable.\textsuperscript{56}

The Queensland Government has also attempted to engage non-government organisations to take the lead by providing a platform for organisations to promote their domestic and family violence initiatives through the ‘Not Now, Not Ever Challenge’ campaign. Organisations are encouraged to upload short videos to the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ website, providing a platform for organisations such as AGL to showcase its domestic and family violence support policy, or the many and varied domestic and family violence prevention month campaigns by organisations such as by Centacare CQ and MY105 in Mackay.

The DCSYW outlined the work it has been undertaking engaging representatives from the business sector to prevent and respond to domestic and family violence through three work streams:

- Workforce training and awareness (internally-focused)
- Sector support (externally focused)
- Leadership and advocacy (externally focused).

This suggests there may be a continued role for government as a repository of information to support delivery of this outcome.

---


\textsuperscript{56} Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services. (2017). Closure of recommendation 41.
8  Supporting outcome four

Do Queensland’s workplaces and workforces challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers?

Key findings

The Government is taking a leadership role in implementing domestic and family violence support policies, with a commitment to changing culture through formal structured processes such as WRA. Government has taken steps toward improving their ability to recognise, support and respond to domestic and family violence, evident through increases in engagement in domestic and family violence training and WRA.

There are signs that the culture within Queensland workplaces is changing, particularly in WRA accredited agencies. Government agencies have increased their self-reported confidence levels in identifying, supporting and referring colleagues who are affected by domestic and family violence. There are indications WRA has contributed to this improvement in confidence. Government WRA agencies report greater confidence in appropriately responding to employees affected by domestic and family violence, compared to those in non-WRA accredited agencies.

Awareness of domestic and family violence support programs is on the rise. Government agencies have increased the awareness levels of domestic and family violence support among their employees. Agencies that have WRA tend to have higher awareness levels of domestic and family violence support programs.

More training may be required for agencies, particularly larger agencies. A number of larger agencies have a low proportion of their workforce who have completed RRR training. Acknowledging challenges associated with training a large workforce, participation in such training is critical to ensure their workforce is equipped and capable of recognising and responding to domestic and family violence.

Progress is being made in private sector organisations to challenge attitudes contributing to violence and put in place processes to effectively support workers, however this tends to be focused on large, well-resourced organisations. It is estimated that 20 private sector organisations operating in Queensland have WRA. Results from the 2018 QSS show that 36% of Queenslanders work in workplaces that have engaged in at least one initiative in the last 12 months. In addition, the percentage of WGEA reporting companies that had a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy in place has increased from 42.4% in 2016-17 to 48.6% in 2017–18. There may be a role for government to influence non-government organisations through raising awareness of the need for a workplace response and providing resources or expertise in how to respond. This could be targeted at small to medium-sized businesses to address current gaps.
The voices of victim survivors

“I called ahead to the hospital to let them know I had a DVO against my ex-partner who worked at the hospital and I was concerned about the privacy of my family. I had worked so hard to change all of my contact details—phone number, address, bank, icloud, everything—for me and my children to feel safe and secure.

The hospital staff tried to do the right thing, making our record anonymous, and taking us to a secluded area, but he’d already seen us come in. It was frightening and distressing for me and my child.

The next day, after being discharged, I got a text message from my ex-partner on my new phone number. He’d managed to get access to our records. All that effort I’d put in to keep me and my children safe—it was gone in a matter of seconds.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.
8.1 Objectives of supporting outcome four

As the victim survivor experience shows, workplaces have an important role in responding to domestic and family violence. This includes how workplaces support victim survivors (e.g., facilitating access to services and support, and maintaining employment), and respond appropriately where employees are alleged (or proven) perpetrators of domestic and family violence. The Human Rights Commission of Australia calls domestic and family violence a ‘workplace issue’. This is due to the complex interrelationships between domestic and family violence and subsequent economic, personal and social costs to businesses and the broader workforce. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) estimated that between 55% and 70% of women who have experienced, or currently are experiencing, domestic and family violence in 2005 were in the workforce,\(^\text{57}\) equating to one in six female workers.

Deloitte Access Economics estimated that the economic cost of domestic and family violence to Australia could reach $15.6 billion annually by 2021–22 based on the policy landscape of 2015.\(^\text{58}\) A large fraction of these economic costs is due to presentism and absenteeism impacting workforce productivity.\(^\text{59}\) The Human Rights Commission of Australia identifies that discrimination towards domestic and family violence victim survivors can take many forms, such as:

- Denial of leave or flexible work arrangements to assist victim survivors to engage in the justice system or move locations/supported housing arrangements
- Termination of employment, or transfers/demotions due to domestic and family violence related absenteeism and presentism issues.\(^\text{60}\)

The ’Not Now, Not Ever’ Report recognises the importance of workplace actions and policies in raising awareness and support for people affected by domestic and family violence, as well as changing attitudes toward domestic and family violence.

Under the Second Action Plan, the Queensland Government implemented eight individual actions aligning to 13 recommendations outlined in the ’Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. The aim of these actions are that: \(^\text{2}\)

- Workplaces recognise domestic and family violence as a workplace issue and support workers
- Queensland employers, workforces and businesses develop and implement policies around leave, workforce participation and respectful relationships that support victim survivors to remain in the workforce.

The following evaluation questions (aligned to intermediate outcomes described in the evaluation framework for the Strategy) are used to explore the extent to which actions implemented under the Second Action Plan are contributing towards the objectives of supporting outcome four:\(^\text{61}\)

- How have workplaces promoted the prevention of domestic and family violence and influenced cultural change?
- How effective have workplaces been in raising awareness of domestic and family violence support?
- How have workplaces built capability to recognise signs of domestic and family violence, and respond and refer appropriately, to better support affected employees?


\(^{59}\) Ibid


8.2 Commitment to cultural change in the workplace
Actions aligned to supporting outcome four aim to support workplaces in recognising domestic and family violence as a workplace issue and to support workers. The degree to which this has occurred is considered in the context of Queensland Government agencies and private organisations.

8.2.1 Queensland Government
The Second Action Plan commits the Queensland Government, as the state’s largest employer, to lead by example by implementing comprehensive domestic and family violence workplace policy reforms. In response, government agencies have implemented an array of policies, training programs and procedures, which have been largely led and coordinated by the PSC. This includes the roll out of Recognise, Respond, Refer (RRR): domestic and family violence in the workplace online training, face-to-face training and accreditation.

Training
RRR was developed by Australia’s CEO Challenge (ACEOC) and the DCSYW in 2015 in response to recommendation 32 of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. The e-learning program aims to build capacity of Queensland Government employees to understand domestic and family violence, recognise signs of domestic and family violence, and gain knowledge to enable them to respond to the situation. The program is currently available to all public service employees and is mandatory in some agencies. All government departments have obtained WRA, the program is also available to non-government organisations through the ACEOC.

This chapter relies on RRR uptake data to explore engagement by Queensland Government agencies with this method of training and awareness raising. It is important to note, however, there are several limitations associated with the RRR uptake data that impact the ability to compare data over time. These limitations include issues associated with the initial implementation of the program prior to 7 July 2017, potential for duplication of completions, and machinery of government changes in December 2017. Nonetheless, the data analysed provides some indication of uptake rates over the evaluation period.

Based on available data of training usage, from 7 July 2017 to 23 November 2018, there have been 12,349 users of domestic and family violence training websites, 75% of whom have gone on to complete the training. This is a completion rate among all Queensland Government employees of approximately 3.4%.63

At an aggregate level by volume of completions, QAS, DCSYW and QPS account for 69% of completions over the period while accounting for approximately 10.5% of employees in the Queensland Government (Chart 8.1).

63 Note: This is not a completion rate of the entire employee base as employees may have completed training twice, and issues with data collection of completions. Government employee headcount is assumed to be 269, 215, sourced from December public service workforce statistics.
Chart 8.1 Departmental breakdown of RRR training completed over 7 July 2017 to 23 November 2018

![Chart 8.1 Departmental breakdown of RRR training completed over 7 July 2017 to 23 November 2018](image)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using RRR enrolments and completions data provided by PSC and collected from ACEOC

Chart 8.2 shows the completion rates for each agency as a percentage of the employment base.\(^{64}\) QAO and ADCQ have the highest uptake rates, followed by QAS, which has the highest number of completions of the training. Agencies with higher employee numbers such as DoE and QH have lower completion rates of the online training compared to agencies with a small number of employees. This is likely due to challenges associated with training workforces with large numbers of employees, including prioritising training for domestic and family violence over other competing priorities such as overseeing frontline service delivery and implementing other reforms (see 4.1). Nonetheless, given these agencies represent some of the largest employers among government agencies, there is likely to be value in encouraging the uptake of training across these agencies to ensure the effect of RRR is optimised across Queensland Government.

The RRR training is aimed at raising awareness of how to identify and respond to domestic and family violence in the workplace (i.e. amongst colleagues), not in the context of client interactions. Despite this, the nature of these agencies mean they have a platform to champion and promote awareness of domestic and family violence as a workplace issue. It should be noted that personnel within these agencies may have access to specialised domestic and family violence training tailored to their service delivery context (for example, see QH case study). While RRR training does not replace the need for specific training for front line workers in how to effectively and sensitively inquire about suspected domestic and family violence, it may play a role in raising the profile of domestic and family violence among agency personnel.

---

\(^{64}\) Results need to be interpreted cautiously, as the denominator is based on data from Current Queensland Public Service Quarterly Workforce Profile of the number of employees as at October 2018.
Chart 8.2 Government employee completions of RRR training from 7 July 2017 to 23 November 2018 as a proportion of agency employee headcount (269,215), 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics estimations using RRR enrolments and completions data provided by PSC and collected from ACEOC. Employee headcount data is sourced from Current Queensland Public Service Quarterly Workforce Profile – October 2018. Headcount data includes permanent, temporary, casual and contract employees. Note: Agency acronyms are pre-MOG changes of December 2017. Department of Corrective Services is labelled separately, noting they are now their own agency (Queensland Corrective Services). October 2018 employee headcount data was used to account for growth in the Queensland Government employment base.

White Ribbon Accreditation (WRA)
While training programs improve the capability of employees, systematic whole-of-agency change to create a workplace that institutionalises cultural change within the organisation is also required. WRA of a workplace is one such mechanism to determine if organisations have positioned themselves towards making this broader cultural change. Consultation findings from a flagship evaluation of Queensland Government’s workplace response to domestic and family violence confirmed WRA is seen by stakeholders as a visible commitment and key enabler for creating cultural change.65

WRA is an internationally recognised accreditation of a workplace that is taking, or has taken, active steps to stop violence against women. The accreditation process assesses organisations against 15 criteria to determine if the steps being taken by the organisation are creating a safer and more respectful workplace. WRA requires Government agency managers and supervisors to undergo domestic and family violence training, specifically, how to prevent, recognise and respond to domestic and family violence. Some agencies provide alternative domestic and family violence

training to managers and leaders that is separate from that approved and promoted by the Queensland Government’s workforce response to domestic and family violence.\textsuperscript{66}

The Queensland Government worked with WRA to co-design a new business and funding model enabling a multi-agency approach to WRA workplace accreditation.

The Interdepartmental Committee (IDC) made a commitment to ensure that all Queensland Government departments be WRA workplaces by 2019. There are 25 government agencies with WRA equating to 100\% of all government departments (21 departments\textsuperscript{67}) (Chart 8.3). Promisingly, there are four non-departmental agencies that have become WRA workplaces, despite not being bound by the IDC’s commitments. These agencies are:

- Public Safety and Business Agency
- Office of the Inspector-General Emergency Management
- Queensland Ambulance Service
- Queensland Rail.

Chart 8.3 The number and projected number of government agencies with WRA, 2016 to 2019

8.2.2 Non-government sector
The Queensland Government accounts for approximately 11\% of the Queensland workforce.\textsuperscript{68} Therefore, to create social change in the way that workforces throughout Queensland address domestic and family violence, it is important that the Strategy aims to influence the policies, programs and culture of private organisations. The ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report puts forward four recommendations aimed at influencing the private sector to adopt policies and practices that align with the Strategy (recommendations 45 to 48).

\textsuperscript{66} ibid.
Capability building
There are some indications of Queensland-wide improvements in private organisations taking a more proactive role to build capability across their workforces in recognising and responding to domestic and family violence, though it is unclear the extent to which this can be attributed to the Second Action Plan. Results from the 2018 QSS show that 36% of Queenslanders work in workplaces that have engaged in at least one domestic and family violence initiative, such as employee support programs, leadership, awareness raising or fundraising in the last 12 months. There has been no statistically significant change in the proportion of Queenslanders working in workplaces that have engaged in an initiative since 2017. However, there have been positive non-statistical movements between 2017 and 2018 that may be indicative of future growth in this statistic.

It is estimated that 20 private sector organisations operating in Queensland have WRA. Of these 20 organisations, seven are headquartered in Queensland, including corporations such as Virgin Australia and the University of Southern Queensland.

Presence of workplace policies
The Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA) collects gender equality data from all non-public organisations that employ more than 100 people on an annual basis. As part of this reporting, organisations are asked about their domestic and family violence strategies, including if they have a formal policy or strategy in place, or if they have more support services that can be accessed by employees affected by domestic and family violence.

Chart 8.4 shows the proportion of non-public WGEA reporting organisations with headquarters in Queensland that reported to the WGEA as having a formalised workplace domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy, for Queensland and Australia from 2016–17 to 2017–18. As of 2017–18, 48.6% of organisations said that they did have a formalised domestic and family violence policy/strategy. This is a 6.2 percentage point increase since 2016–17. Moreover, this growth outpaced that of Australia, with only a 3.8 percentage point increase in organisations implementing formalised domestic and family violence policies/strategies over the same period nationally.

Chart 8.4 Percentage of Queensland non-government WGEA reporting organisations who have a workplace domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy; Queensland and Australia, 2016–17 to 2017–18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using WGEA public report data

70 WGEA reporting period is from 1 April to 31 March each year.
There appear to be two barriers to non-government organisations implementing domestic and family violence policies and strategies; resources and awareness. First, the ability to implement formalised policies appears to be aligned with the resources available within organisations. The WGEA data provides some indications of the barriers to implementing a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy in Queensland. Fifteen per cent of Queensland-based organisations reporting to the WGEA that did not have a domestic and family violence strategy and/or policy in 2017–18 cited a lack of sufficient resources and/or expertise to do so. This is evidenced by the fact that organisations implementing a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy tended to be larger, with a median of 351 employees. This is compared to a median of 246 employees for organisations that did not have a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy, and a median of 238 employees for those that cited resources as a barrier.

Second, almost one in five organisations without a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy in place cited a lack of awareness of a need for a policy and/or strategy, and/or an admission that a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy was not a priority at the time of reporting. Organisations without a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy tended to be operating within industries with a slightly larger representation of women in management positions (median of 38.5% of women in management, compared to 33.8% in those with a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy).\(^71\)

These results suggest there may be an ongoing role for government to influence non-government organisations through raising awareness of the need for a policy and/or strategy, why this is a

\(^71\) The percentage of organisations with a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy within each industry and the percentage of women in management positions within those industries has a correlation of 0.3. This correlation increases to 0.8 when replacing the percentage of women in management positions with the moving average of the percentage of women in management positions – a variable that indicates the trend of a data series.
priority and providing resources or expertise in how to do this. This could be targeted at small to medium-sized businesses to address current gaps.

There are some indications that the private sector is showing an improvement in understanding the need to provide domestic and family violence support services to employees. In 2017–18, four out of 65 (6.2%) organisations that cited a lack of awareness of the need for domestic and family violence support within the workplace in 2016–17 adopted a formal domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy in 2017–18. The number of organisations citing the lack of awareness of the need for domestic and family violence support within the workplace declined from 65 organisations in 2016–17 to 51 organisations in 2017–18. This is indicative of an improved understanding within Queensland organisations of the importance of domestic and family violence support services in the workplace.

Non-government organisations appear to take an incremental approach to cultural change to respond to domestic and family violence in their workplace. Figure 8.1 shows the typical pathways that organisations followed from not providing any domestic and family violence support arrangements for their employees to institutionalising a formalised domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy from 2016–17 to 2017–18. This shows that most organisations that alter their domestic and family support mechanisms do so by first providing some support mechanism, such as access to EAP or paid leave. Organisations that then progress to institute a formalised domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy are more likely to be those that were already offering some domestic and family violence support arrangement. These dynamics accounted for most of the growth in Queensland organisations having a formalised policy and/or strategy in 2017–18.

Figure 8.1 Pathway to offering a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy by WGEA reporting non-government organisations from 2016–17 to 2017–18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using WGEA public report data
**8.3 Changing awareness of domestic and family violence support**

Raising employee awareness of domestic and family violence support available both within and beyond the workplace is an important objective of the Strategy, and is a step toward creating cultural and behavioural change within the workplace. There is limited data available about the degree to which non-government organisations have raised awareness of domestic and family violence support with their employee base, therefore, this analysis focuses solely on the Queensland Government.

In this section, the evidence to date for the change in awareness has been sourced from stakeholder consultations, as well as the Working for Queensland (WfQ) survey. For example, anecdotal evidence is provided from consultations with DHPW staff which show efforts by this department to provide training for staff located in Housing Support Centres to recognise and respond appropriate to clients presenting with circumstances and concerns relating to domestic and family violence. In addition, the WfQ survey is another avenue to gauge the awareness of domestic and family violence support within government agencies.

In 2017, an average of 76% of public sector employees who responded to the WfQ reported being aware of domestic and family violence support policies at their workplace. This was a six percentage point increase over the previous year (statistically significant). Comparing the results of employees of agencies that currently have WRA (as at May 2019) against those that do not is a possible indication of the impacts of workplace policies that were implemented to gain WRA (Chart 8.6).

Chart 8.6 Average agency response rates of ‘yes’ to the WfQ question, ‘Are you aware of any policies, in your workplace, designed to support employees affected by domestic and family violence?’, comparison of WRA and non-WRA agencies, 2016 to 2017

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Working for Queensland Survey data 2016 and 2017 provided by PSC. Note: 2018 data was not included as the data was not provided. WfQ data for 2016 was adjusted to exclude DoE school based responses as these were excluded from the 2017 WfQ survey.

---

72 A t-test for equal means is conducted. P-value = 0.0025 for right-tail t-test of alternative hypothesis that mean of 2017 is greater than 2016, level of significance is assumed to be 0.05.
The results show that, compared to Queensland government agencies without WRA, respondents from those Queensland government agencies with WRA are significantly more likely to report being aware of policies in their workplace designed to support employees affected by domestic and family violence. This does not provide conclusive evidence that WRA is directly impacting the awareness of workplace domestic and family violence support policies, rather, it is an indication that there may be some association between WRA and awareness that should be further explored.

Increases over 2016 and 2017 in the proportion of respondents reporting an awareness of policies in their workplace designed to support employees affected by domestic and family violence, were similar across WRA and non-WRA agencies. This suggests there may be other factors raising awareness across the public sector regarding domestic and family violence policies in their workplace.

While awareness of policies designed to support employees affected by domestic and family violence within the Queensland public sector has increased (from 69% in 2016 to 76% in 2018 for the public sector as a whole), a flagship evaluation of the Queensland Government’s workplace response to domestic and family violence found that there was limited knowledge of what these policies contain. Across nine scenario sessions involving a non-representative sample of 60 government staff conducted within the evaluation, participants acknowledged the significance of domestic and family violence as an issue, however knowledge of the existence of policies for responding, or the specific components of policies was mixed.

This suggests that an ongoing focus may be warranted to ensure employees move from awareness to a deeper understanding of workplace policies and procedures. This acknowledges awareness as the first step, following with changes in understanding and uptake expected over a longer period.

---

73 A t-test for equal means is conducted. P-value = 0.0068 for right-tail t-test of alternative hypothesis that 2017 WRA mean is larger than 2017 Non-WRA mean, level of significance is assumed to be 0.05.
8.4 Responding and providing support to those affected by domestic and family violence

Responding to colleagues affected by domestic and family violence

Translating awareness of general workplace policies into capability and action requires employees to:

a. recognise domestic and family violence
b. know how to respond and feel confident in their ability to respond
c. be aware of the support services available and feel capable of referring colleagues.

Chart 8.7 shows that 8.9% of Queensland Government employees responded to a colleague affected by domestic and family violence in the previous 12 months.

Chart 8.7 Proportion of WfQ survey respondents who responded to an employee/colleague affected by domestic and family violence in the past 12 months, 2017

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Working for Queensland survey data 2017 provided by PSC. Note: 2018 data was not used as aggregate data was not provided.

Importantly, Queensland Government employees report improved self-efficacy in responding to colleagues with domestic and family violence. Self-efficacy is measured through the WfQ questions:

- ‘I am confident that I could sensitively communicate with colleagues/employees affected by domestic and family violence’ (communication) and
- ‘I am confident that I could effectively refer a colleague/employee affected by domestic and family violence to appropriate support’ (referral)

Results for communication and referral self-efficacy are shown in Chart 8.8 and Chart 8.9 respectively. The results are presented disaggregated by management and non-management respondents, and also split by current and future WRA accredited agencies, as at January 2019 (noting that all departments are accredited as at May 2019). Current and future WRA accredited agencies are used as these agencies are more likely to have mandatory training programs, as well as other domestic and family violence support and awareness programs and activities required to meet WRA criteria.
From 2016-2018, current and future WRA accredited agencies recorded year-on-year improvements in self-efficacy in communication and referral, in management and non-management personnel. Change in year-on-year for non-WRA agencies was variable in both the communication and referral elements. With the increased uptake of WRA, it is difficult to discern whether the reduction in self-efficacy for non-WRA agencies between 2017 and 2018 is a true effect, or the result of personnel in agencies shifting to the current and future WRA category as their agency commences the accreditation process. Overall, self-efficacy was higher in management personnel compared to non-management personnel.

Chart 8.8 Average agency response rates of ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly Agree’ by Queensland Government WFQ respondents to ‘I am confident that I could sensitively communicate with colleagues affected by domestic and family violence’, disaggregated by management and non-management employees and by WRA agencies, 2016 to 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Working for Queensland survey data 2016, 2017 and 2018 provided by PSC. Note: 2018 survey response from the WFQ survey have not been publicly released and therefore, this analysis is subject to change as a result of the Department of Premier and Cabinet’s final report review process. 2018 data does not appear to include all survey results, therefore caution should be taken when comparing across years.
Chart 8.9 Average agency response rates of ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly Agree’ by Queensland Government WfQ respondents to ‘I am confident that I could effectively refer a colleague/employee affected by domestic and family violence to appropriate support’, disaggregated management and non-management employees and by WRA, 2016 to 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Working for Queensland survey data 2016, 2017 and 2018 provided by PSC.
Note: 2018 survey response from the WfQ survey have not been publicly released and therefore, this analysis is subject to change as a result of the Department of Premier and Cabinet’s final report review process. 2018 data does not appear to include all survey results, therefore caution should be taken when comparing across years.
Chart 8.10 Average agency response rates of 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' by managerial Queensland Government staff to 'If I was made aware (e.g. by other colleagues) that domestic and family violence was affecting an employee, I am confident that I could respond appropriately', disaggregated by agency WRA, 2016 to 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Working for Queensland survey data 2016, 2017 and 2018 provided by PSC.
Note: 2018 survey response from the WfQ survey have not been publicly released and therefore, this analysis is subject to change as a result of the Department of Premier and Cabinet's final report review process. 2018 data does not appear to include all survey results, therefore caution should be taken when comparing across years.
Employee Assistance Program (EAP) services and other supports offered

Queensland Government

In addition to engaging with colleagues within the workforce, there has been increased use of EAP services in government agencies for reasons related to domestic and family violence. Chart 8.11 shows the number of EAP cases where domestic and family violence is listed as the main reason.\textsuperscript{75} The data shows that there has been a substantial increase in EAP appointments when domestic and family violence is listed as the primary reason since 2014–15. This trend has continued from 2014–15 to 2017–18, increasing from seven to 37 appointments in the most recent financial year. Given the size of the public sector and the prevalence of domestic and family violence, this number of appointments seems small. As a result, the flagship evaluation recommended increasing understanding of low access to EAP support.

Chart 8.11 Number of Queensland Government EAP services accessed where domestic and family violence was listed as the primary reason for the engagement; 2011-12 to 2017-18

\textbf{EAP engagement data has a number of limitations. First, there is no indication of whether each engagement is unique, or the engagements are by the same person multiple times over a period. Second, only EAP engagements when domestic and family violence is listed as the primary reason are captured. This therefore does not capture EAP engagements where domestic and family violence is not identified as the primary reason.}

\textbf{Non-Government Sector}

An increasing number of non-government organisations are providing services to assist their employees experiencing domestic and family violence. As of 2017–18, 85.7\% of Queensland non-government organisations reporting to the WGEA had services in place to assist people impacted by domestic and family violence.\textsuperscript{76} This was on par with all recorded non-public organisations throughout Australia. Over the 12-month period from 2016–17 to 2017–18, Queensland non-

\textsuperscript{75} This is likely to be an underestimate as it does not capture those EAP cases where domestic and family violence may be a secondary or tertiary reason. Domestic and family violence is also frequently underreported.

government organisations reporting to the WGEA providing services to assist employees affected by domestic and family violence grew by over five percentage points, compared to 3.5 percentage points for Australia as a whole (Chart 8.12).

Chart 8.12 Percentage of Queensland-based organisations reporting to the WGEA with workplace arrangements to assist people dealing with domestic and family violence; Queensland and Australia, 2016-17 to 2017-18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using WGEA public report data

Most non-public Queensland organisations reporting to the WGEA offered their employers a mix of access to support services and time off work to assist employees experiencing domestic and family violence. More specifically, 85% of non-government organisations reporting to the WGEA that offer at least one support mechanism, offer EAP services. More than 70% of organisations offer their employees flexible working arrangements and access to unpaid leave (Chart 8.13).
Chart 8.13 Top 10 types of support mechanisms in place as a percentage of non-government WGEA reporting organisations with a domestic and family violence support mechanism in place, 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Mechanism</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace safety planning</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of key personnel</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of financial support</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer change of office location</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from any adverse action or discrimination based on the disclosure of</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral of employees to appropriate services for expert advice</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality of matters disclosed</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to unpaid leave</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working arrangements</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using WGEA public report data
9 Supporting outcome five

To what extent are victim survivors and their families safe and supported?

Key findings

Stories from victim survivors show a diversity of experiences, though collectively, they show more is needed to be done to ensure services are consistently responsive to their needs.

Overall, **service providers are generally positive about the contribution of the domestic and family violence reforms toward a range of service system indicators for victim survivors, including access to and uptake of services. However, more could be done to ensure this translates into improved feelings of safety.**

**Referrals to crisis accommodation have remained high and stable from 2015-16 to 2017-18.** Approximately 91% of referrals for crisis accommodation were completed within 24 hours.

**The number of transfers and time for a transfer has increased.** The data indicates that the length of time for a transfer to occur has increased from a median of 2.6 months in 2015-16 to 4.3 months in 2017-18. Transfers of social housing tenancies to government owned and managed social rental housing increased by 76 from 2015-16 to 2017-18.

The **number of SHS clients citing domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking SHS assistance increased** from 7,151 in 2015-16 to 8,002 in 2017-18. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are over-represented in SHS clients.

**There are indications of increasing demand for post-crisis services,** including brokerage funding, social rental housing applicants, bond loans and rental grants. The number of counselling service users with closed cases increased by 34% between 2015-16 and 2017-18 due to all needs being met. Further investigation is required to understand whether there are sufficient resources within the sector to meet this demand.

**Flexible funding options** is one idea that was raised in consultations to better support victims, and is reflected in more victims accessing brokerage funding and success stories from funding to pursue education to support long-term recovery.
This section refers to a range of different terms:

- **Social housing** – comprises Social Rental Housing plus Crisis Accommodation Program and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Local Government communities
- **Crisis accommodation** – the crisis accommodation program funds providers to help eligible people (those who are homeless, in crisis, at risk of homelessness, or in need of support to transition to independent living) find accommodation.
- **Government-owned and managed social rental housing** – comprises both the public rental housing program and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing rental program
- **Social rental housing** – programs included Public Rental Housing, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing Rental Program, Community Rent Scheme, Same House Different Landlord, Long-Term Community Housing Program, Community-managed Housing-Studio Units, Affordable Housing Program and Supportive Housing
- **Transfers** – social housing tenants may transfer between and within community and public housing based on assessed need. Data presented in this chapter only counts transfers to/within Government-owned and managed social rental housing.\(^7\)

\(^7\) Definitions provided by DHPW
“I am 16 years old. Growing up with domestic violence has made me mature faster than I would have if I had lived an abuse free childhood.

However, I’m not ashamed of my experiences as they have created the person who I am today, and I’m proud of who I am. I am a strong, independent, bright young woman, no matter the past.”

- Domestic and Family Violence DFVI Council, Progress Report 1 December 2017 – 30 November 2018
9.1 Objective of supporting outcome five
Supporting outcome five contributes to foundational element two – an integrated service response system that delivers the services and support that victim survivors and perpetrators need.

The ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report put forward more than 20 recommendations aimed at improving the accessibility, appropriateness and effectiveness of domestic and family violence support services including; integrated response trials; crisis and supportive housing; and, a new funding model to guide investment in appropriate and effective domestic and family violence support services.

Under the Second Action Plan, the Queensland Government has progressed 22 individual actions (and five enabling actions) aligning to 23 recommendations produced in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. The aim of these actions are:

- Integrated services are all inclusive to respond, rebuild, empower and create economic independence.
- Integrated services provide culturally-appropriate wraparound services to help victim survivors and their families escape violence, access or maintain stable and safe housing, help victim survivors rebuild and empower their lives and support survivors to become independent and not return to violence.

This analysis measures the degree to which these objectives are met, and how they align with the overarching supporting outcome by answering the following five evaluation questions for intermediate outcomes:78

- Has the Strategy helped build culturally appropriate service responses that meet the needs of victim survivors?
- How effective have integrated services been in supporting victim survivors’ needs?
- To what extent has the Strategy facilitated improved access to appropriate and responsive services to victim survivors of domestic and family violence?
- Has the access to, and responsiveness of, services helped victim survivors to rebuild their lives, gain independence and avoid re-victimisation?

9.2 Overall progress to date
Results to the Service Provider Survey (2019)79 showed that the majority of respondents agreed that the domestic and family violence reforms contributed to an increase in access to, and uptake of, services (Chart 9.1, Q2:1 and Q2:2).

Service providers appear less convinced that the domestic and family violence reforms have contributed to improved feelings of and actual safety for victims of domestic and family violence. Specifically, only half of all survey respondents agreed with this statement (Chart 9.1, Q2:4). This suggests that while there may be perceptions of increases in access to, and uptake of services, there is still more work to do to ensure this manifests into improved feelings of, and actual safety.

The voices of victim survivors

“I called QPS to have my ex-partners weapons collected from the house. I was told I had to take them into the station myself. When I took them in I was told that because they belonged to my ex, there was a chance that he could get them back. This didn’t make me feel safe.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.

---

79 The Service Provider Survey 2019 was designed and fielded by Deloitte Access Economics. The aim of the survey was to understand the views of service providers on the impacts of the Second Action Plan on its provision of services and outcomes of victim survivors and perpetrators. The survey was distributed to service providers across Queensland with a contract with the Queensland Government.
Chart 9.1 Service providers’ level of agreement with statements on whether and how the domestic and family violence reforms in Queensland have led to changes in victim survivor experiences, where 1=strongly disagree and 10=strongly agree (n=23), 2019

Service providers held positive views in terms of how the domestic and family violence reforms have impacted their service, including the awareness and uptake of their service. Service providers were particularly likely to agree that the reforms have led to an increase in uptake of the services their organisation provides (Chart 9.2, Q 7:2). More than 50% of people who responded to the Service Provider Survey agreed or strongly agreed that their service is better able to meet the needs of clients and achieve outcomes for clients because of the Queensland domestic and family violence reforms.

The voices of victim survivors

“It took me months to get through to 1800 RESPECT. The number would always ring out, and finding times when it was safe to call were few and far between, and trying to find a pay phone to call from. When I did get through, they said they couldn’t help me. They expected me to leave my home, but it was my home, and I would have lost everything. When I called again, I was referred to counselling, to lodge a DVO, and to get a safety plan.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Deloitte designed Service Provider Survey
Other progress against this supporting outcome includes funding for the Support for Young Children Affected by Domestic and Family Violence (SYCADFV) grants program.

The SYCADFV grants program provided funding to 18 non-government organisations to support the learning, social, emotional and behavioural development of children aged birth to eight years who are experiencing vulnerability from domestic and family violence related trauma. The SYCADFV grants program delivered:

- seven projects providing therapeutic and family support interventions
- five projects enhancing awareness of the impacts of domestic and family violence on young children and/or the capability to provide trauma informed care
- three projects delivering professional development and therapeutic intervention
- four projects providing equipment and resources to make domestic and family violence services more child-friendly
- one service producing a multi-lingual film clip developed through children’s artwork and stories to support non-English speaking mothers and children who have experienced domestic and family violence.80

80 Information provided by the Department of Education 23 January 2019
9.3 Empowering and equipping the sector to recognise domestic and family violence and take action

The services throughout the health, human, education and justice system, that come into contact with victim survivors, perpetrators, and their families, have a role in recognising the signs of domestic and family violence, and taking appropriate action.

The Death Review and Advisory Board found that of the 19 cases it reviewed where service system contacts were reported and empirically analysed in 2017–18, approximately 40% of the 536 domestic and family violence contacts these cases generated were with the police. It found that while health practitioners play a critical role in recognising and responding to domestic and family violence, evidence suggests ‘practitioners did not adequately respond to open and repeated disclosures of abusive and threatening behaviours to intimate partners and family members’.

The voices of victim survivors

“I was in a controlling relationship. He would harass me at work, and create all types of dramas that I couldn’t find support for.

I got sick and ended up in hospital. Overall the hospital staff were fantastic. I had a referral from the staff to a DV service who arranged for a locksmith to go to my house to change the locks while I was in hospital. The nurses placed me in a locked ward in a single room right next to the nurses’ station. They blocked my record too so if someone called the hospital, there was no record of me being there.

My husband came into the hospital one day acting violently. After he left, QPS brought him back in and he was admitted to the mental health ward on an involuntary treatment order because he’d been so violent in the hospital. He was calling me 50 to 60 times per day when I was an inpatient. When I didn’t answer, I then started getting phone calls from his nurse, asking me when I was going to forgive my husband. I spoke to the doctor who tried to get the nurse to stop calling.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.

workforce to identify and appropriately refer patients experiencing domestic and family violence through building knowledge and skills. While the effectiveness of the referral model has been mixed, where it has worked well there has been both an increase in referral numbers and improvement in the quality of referrals. This has been particularly effective where there has been a domestic and family violence worker acting in a health liaison role. Service providers and government agencies appear to benefit from improved information sharing, capability building to improve awareness of clients’ unique needs and experiences and available referral pathways. This highlight the importance of front line services being the ‘eyes and ears’ of the sector, and the important role they have in early recognition and referral to appropriate support and services.

It is important that the service sector is able to recognise and respond to domestic and family violence in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, given their experiences, dynamics and contexts of domestic and family violence differ to non-Indigenous communities. Consultations with agency staff in regional areas also highlighted how the Strategy was impacting their ability to respond in a culturally appropriate way to domestic and family violence. In particular, it appears integrated service responses in regional and rural communities may have contributed to more culturally appropriate responses due to the implementation of community co-designed responses. It was identified that the collaborative efforts, and increased information sharing in these regions, between government agencies such as DATSIP, HRT teams, the service sector and communities,

has enabled increasingly more culturally appropriate responses. It was also articulated it would be useful for DATSIP to be part of the HRT membership, to facilitate information sharing. As indicated previously in this report, DATSIP is not an HRT core member (as it does not deliver frontline services to clients). DATSIP is also not responsible for the cultural competence of agencies participating in the HRT but provides guidance and advice on increasing the cultural capability of all agencies and place-based integrated service response and HRT models. All agencies are responsible for ensuring their workforces (including HRT members) are culturally capable and can respond to domestic and family violence risk assessment and safety management in a culturally appropriate manner. The flagship evaluation may provide further insights and learnings as to the challenges associated with culturally appropriate responses within HRTs and how these can best be addressed under the Third Action Plan.

9.4 Crisis support

9.4.1 Crisis accommodation

Referrals to crisis accommodation has remained high and stable over the period 2015-16 to 2017-18 (see Chart 9.3: a). This shows there are high numbers of referrals to crisis accommodation for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (consistently more than 37% of referrals), suggesting the ability to ensure culturally appropriate responses are important for this service. The proportion of referrals that are rejected has also remained low and consistent over time. Under the Second Action Plan, new crisis shelters are being established in Charters Towers and Roma, in addition to a mobile support service on the Gold Coast.

Chart 9.3 Referrals for government funded crisis accommodation due to escaping domestic and family violence, 2015-16 to 2017-18

There has been largely no change to the timeliness of referral processing for government funded crisis accommodation due to escaping domestic and family violence. The majority of referrals are completed within the first 24 hours (91.4% in 2017–18), with less than 10% of referrals taking longer than 24 hours to process. Further, the timeliness of referral for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people appears to be slightly faster than non-Indigenous people, with 94.4% of referrals completed within 24 hours in 2017–18.

The voices of victim survivors

“I am an educated woman. I thought that if I turned every stone I would find a solution to my ex-husband’s violence. But after every stone had been turned, the violence continued. I had no choice but to run away.”

9.4.2 Transfers to safer accommodation

Transfers can occur when a social rental housing tenant requests a transfer to an alternative address due to domestic and family violence at their current address. Transfers, in some instances, are an important mechanism for people of a lower socio-economic status to escape domestic and family violence situations. To promote the safety of the person, it is important such requests are actioned quickly, where possible.

There has been a growth of 76 transfers of social housing tenancies to government owned and managed social rental housing as a result of domestic and family violence from 2015-16 to 2017-18 (Chart 9.5:a).

There has been some growth in the number of transfers of social housing tenancies to government owned and managed social rental housing as a result of domestic and family violence within LGAs from 2015-16 to 2017-18 (Chart 9.5:b). Most notably, Brisbane (26), Logan (22), Townsville (18) and Mount Isa (8) accounted for most of the total transfer growth when comparing transfers in 2017-18 to levels in 2015-16.\(^{82}\) Annual transfers in the regions of Logan, Townsville and Mount Isa have grown at a relatively faster rate than those of Brisbane. It is important to note that the regions of North and South Brisbane, as well as Townsville\(^{83}\) (as part of the Stronger Families reforms), Logan and Mount Isa (as part of the integrated service response trials) have all received dedicated funding to improve the integration of services.

\(^{82}\) Growth is calculated as the aggregate increase of transfers occurring in 2017-18 over transfers occurring in 2015-16. Therefore, it does not adjust for population differences (growth and stock).

These results may suggest that integrated service responses may be having an impact on transferring people from unsafe accommodation to safer accommodation. In the case of Logan and Mount Isa, this may be because High Risk Teams (HRTs) are supporting the process of transferring people to safer housing, compared to locations where victim survivors may need to undertake this process themselves or with the support of a community-based domestic and family violence service.

Chart 9.5  Total number and growth of transfers from social housing to government owned and managed social rental housing as a result of domestic and family violence

Of importance is the timeliness in which people are transferred upon request from social housing to safer accommodation. Chart 9.6 shows the time it takes to transfer someone from social housing to government owned and managed social rental housing as a result of domestic and family violence. The data indicates that the length of time for a transfer to occur has increased from a median of 2.6 months in 2015–16 to 4.3 months in 2017–18.

The increase in allocation times for transfers could be driven by a number of factors. One factor may be constraints on the timeliness for a suitable property to become available – a key dependency of enabling the transfer to occur. Exacerbating this is the increase in transfers from 160 to 236 from 2015–16 to 2017–18, which may be a source of added pressure on government social rental housing stocks. Properties may also be declined by tenants, which has flow-on implications for the timeliness of the transfers. Temporary accommodation may be provided while a transfer is underway.

It is important to note that victim survivors awaiting transfers may be offered alternative accommodation support (such as shelters) and other services to increase their feelings of safety, such as more lighting, changed locks and other increased security measures as required. However, the growth in processing times for transfers does merit investigation.
Chart 9.6 Allocation time of transfers from social housing to government owned and managed social rental housing as a result of domestic and family violence, 2015-16 to 2017-18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Government owned and managed social rental housing data provided by DHPW
9.4.3 Specialist Homelessness Services

Domestic and family violence is one of the largest causes of homelessness in Australia. In 2017-18, domestic and family violence was the main reason for seeking SHS agency assistance for approximately one in five clients, and one of the multiple reasons for seeking assistance for almost one in three SHS clients. Among women seeking SHS agency assistance in 2017-18 (n = 23,312), domestic and family violence was the main reason for more the one in four applicants (n = 6,472, 27.8%) (Chart 9.7).

Chart 9.7 The number of Queensland SHS clients by main reason for seeking assistance, top five reasons for all clients, 2017-18

Source: Specialist homelessness services data 2017-18 accessed from AIHW. Note: Housing crisis refers to an event where a person was formally evicted from, or asked to vacate, their previous accommodation arrangement. Other refers to all other categories that SHS clients identify as the main reason for seeking assistance, such as mental health issues, lack of family support or problem gambling, amongst other reasons.

Access to SHS services

The number of SHS clients citing domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking SHS assistance increased from 7,151 in 2015-16 to 8,002 in 2017-18. However, there has been a slight decline since 2016-17 (from 8,222 to 8,002), largely due to a decline in male clients, which decreased from 2,302 to 2,056 over this period. The numbers of female clients presenting for SHS assistance with domestic and family violence as the main reason stabilised between 2016-17 and 2017-18 (growth of 0.4% between years), despite a spike in numbers between 2015-16 and 2016-17 (growth of 14.3% between years).

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are over-represented in SHS clients. As of 2017-18, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people accounted for 30% of all SHS who report domestic and family violence as their main reason for seeking SHS services. However, growth in the number of

---

84 A specialist homelessness agency delivers accommodation and personal services (including material aid/brokerage) to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.
86 Totals in Chart 9.7 do not add to 8,002 as they are from two different sources, one of which is weighted and the other is unweighted. The 8,002 figure is calculated from unpublished data provided to Deloitte Access Economics by AIHW. Additionally data for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and non-Indigenous SHS clients in 2017-18 in Chart 9.8 do not add up to 8,002 as there is a small portion of total clients that do not belong in either of these two categories.
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who provide domestic and family violence as their main reason for seeking SHS assistance has been slower than the number of non-Indigenous people from 2015-16 to 2017-18. This was particularly true when comparing growth for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and non-Indigenous women (Chart 9.8).

Chart 9.8 The number of SHS clients with domestic and family violence as their main reason for seeking assistance, by gender and ethnicity, 2015–16 to 2017–18

The geographical distribution of SHS clients with domestic and family violence as their main reason for seeking assistance is displayed in Chart 9.9 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and total clients in 2017-18. The single LGA with the highest proportion of clients seeking SHS assistance is Cairns, which accounts for 14.4% of all SHS clients in 2017-18. A further 45.2% of all clients are located in the Logan-Beaudesert, Ipswich, Gold Coast and greater Brisbane region.

Source: Queensland Specialist homelessness services data 2015–16 to 2017–18 provided by AIHW
Chart 9.9 Regional distribution of SHS clients with domestic and family violence as their main reason for seeking assistance, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and total clients, 2017-18

a) Distribution of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander SHS clients

b) Distribution of total SHS clients (including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people)

Source: Queensland Specialist homelessness services data 2017-18 provided by AIHW

Most Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander clients are located in the regions of outback Queensland (24.1%), Cairns (21.5%) and Townsville (12.2%). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people account for between 40% to 89% of clients in the regions of Cairns (44.2%), Central Queensland (45.5%), Townsville (53.6%) and outback Queensland (88.8%) (Chart 9.9).
Outcomes of SHS assistance

An important measure of success of SHS services is their ability to reduce the risk of homelessness as quickly as possible. In 2017–18, among those SHS clients with domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking assistance, 71% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients and 59% of non-Indigenous clients were supported for between one and 45 days. A higher proportion of non-Indigenous clients (41%) than Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients (29%) with domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking assistance received support for 46 days or longer in 2017–18. Further, the percentage of people that have received support for longer than 45 days is relatively unchanged since 2015–16 for both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients and non-Indigenous clients (Chart 9.10).

Chart 9.10 Length of support provided for SHS clients with domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking assistance, 2015–16 to 2017–18

Source: Queensland Specialist homelessness services data 2015–16 to 2017–18 provided by AIHW
Another important indicator of the effectiveness of SHS for domestic and family violence victim survivors is the manner in which people exit support. Chart 9.11 shows the types of housing that SHS clients, who identify domestic and family violence as the main reason for support, live in once they finalise support with SHS agencies in 2015–16 and 2017–18. The data shows that approximately one in five SHS clients are in private housing, while another 40% are in public/community housing. These figures have been largely stable from 2015–16 to 2017–18. Fewer Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients were in private or other housing at the end of support provided by SHS in 2017–18 when compared to 2015–16. Furthermore, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients were more likely to report being in short-term temporary accommodation following support provided for SHS clients in 2017–18 compared to 2015–16.

Chart 9.11 Housing situation at end of support provided for SHS clients with domestic and family violence as the main reason for seeking assistance, 2015–16 to 2017–18

Source: Queensland Specialist homelessness services data 2015-16 to 2017-18 provided by AIHW
9.4.4 Justice system responses

Justice system responses are discussed in more detail in supporting outcome seven. Specific initiatives that are victim survivor-focused appear to be creating a positive experience for victim survivor safety and support. For example, the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court showed how various features of the court assisted to improve victim survivor feelings of safety:

"The fact that you had a domestic violence support worker who was knowledgeable about the situation you were coming from and what you were going to expect in court. The camaraderie of women who have spent the better part of their life shutting up because of domestic violence, to be laughing and speaking and sharing battle scar wound stories and then supporting each other as each person went through the court process, no matter who you were. And you never met any of them before that day. The fact that you have judges, like the judges you have in Southport that are understanding, that are very informative, that speak in a language that you can understand even when they use big complicated terms, they – all of the people in the whole process including having a safe room ‘cause to me, that was priority. Having a shotgun to your face is the most unpleasant experience in the world”

-Victim from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court. Griffith University Evaluation of the Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court Trial in Southport (2017)

9.5 Medium to longer-term support

The voices of victim survivors

"Merely leaving a violent relationship is not the end of the story. It is never the cure, the resolution or the conclusion. I carry the physical, psychological and emotional scars with me every day for life.”


Stakeholders noted the importance of incorporating responses that support victim survivors over the medium and long-term so they are able to rebuild their lives and sustain a life free from violence. There is increasing demand for these types of services, including brokerage funding, accommodation and counselling services. Yet consultations with stakeholders suggest more may be required to support victim survivors post-crisis.

9.5.1 Flexible funding

One mechanism for post-crisis support is flexible funding. Stakeholders suggested that an effective mechanism for this could be through providing flexible support packages, including for their housing needs. That is, victim survivors identifying how funding can best be directed to meet their individual housing or other needs.

There are a range of flexible support packages currently provided by The Queensland Government to support the needs of victim survivors of domestic and family violence in the context of their support plan, such as loans for bonds. Brokerage funding for safety upgrades to the homes of victim survivors is an important mechanism in allowing victim survivors to remain safely in their homes. In this context, brokerage funds are provided for victim survivors to purchase required physical security upgrades to their homes, such as personal alarms and mobile telephones.87

**A nice sit-down meal**

A teenager who has been in out-of-home care his entire life, in and out of school and subjected to family and domestic violence was struggling to find motivation. He enrolled in a SQW project offering a Certificate II course with the aim to stay motivated and get a job. He was also desperate to be a good role model for his sibling. He completed his work experience and asked his supervisor if he could volunteer more hours with the company to gain more ‘hands-on’ experience. The supervisor was blown away by his initiative and hard work and took him out to dinner to say thank you.

The young participant reported back to the project coordinator saying "I have been in child safety my entire life and have never had anyone take me out for a nice sit down meal before. It meant a lot to me.” He’s since been offered part-time employment with the company.

Chart 9.12 displays the amount of brokerage funds for safety upgrades to the homes of victim survivors provided per year and the number of victim survivors provided with brokerage. From 2015–16 to 2017–18, the number of victim survivors receiving brokerage funds for safety upgrades has increased 98.7%, while the brokerage funding available has increased 9.1%. While the amount provided to each client varies based on risk and need, these two trends mean that on average, victim survivors are receiving less brokerage funds. That is, there is similar funding being distributed to an increasing number of people.

Chart 9.12 Total value of brokerage funds provided per year and total number of victim survivors provided brokerage, 2015-16 to 2017-18

Source: OASIS Home Security Upgrades data provided by DCSYW
The Government’s Annual VET Investment Plan continues to provide an avenue for disadvantaged Queenslanders, including those experiencing domestic and family violence, to access subsidised training and skills development opportunities through programs such as User Choice, Certificate 3 Guarantee, Higher Level Skills and Skilling Queenslanders for Work. Specifically, women re-entering the workforce has been a focus of the funding offered through the Skilling Queenslanders for Work since 2016-17, a proportion of whom experience domestic and family violence. This is in response to recommendations that have encouraged the Department of Employment, Small Business and Training (DESBT) to ‘provide access to subsidised training and skills incentives for those who experience domestic and family violence’. While the absence of data means the extent to which this funding incentive has assisted victim survivors to re-build their lives through employment (and by consequence more financial independence) is unknown, two case studies highlight the impact this can have on making victim survivors feel safe and supported.\(^{88}\)

**First full-time employment**

One participant was an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander woman with several children. She didn’t complete primary school and was long-term unemployed. She was recruited to a Community Work Skills project that offered support and assistance to gain a Certificate II in Hospitality for employment in the local hospitality sector. She was provided with case management and a range of support including employability skills; life skills; language, literacy and numeracy assistance; budgeting; basic computer skills; communication skills and personal presentation to assist them to achieve their goals.

The participant was also referred to specialist agencies for counselling and support to overcome her personal barriers and lack of self-confidence. After completing her vocational placement, she applied for a position at a local hotel and to her surprise, was successful in obtaining the job. She is now **employed in her first paid job** and her children are so proud of her. They can see how hard work, motivation and improved self-esteem can change a person’s life for the better.

**9.5.2 Non-crisis accommodation**

Recorded demand for medium to longer-term social housing by people experiencing domestic and family violence has increased. The housing register statistics includes applicants with verified domestic violence codes on their housing needs assessment and provides insight into Queensland’s trends of domestic violence accommodation from 2016 to 2018. The number of applicants on the housing register with domestic violence codes has more than doubled each year between the years 2016 to 2018. From 2016 to 2017, the number of applicants with domestic violence codes increased from 343 to 658 (92% increase) and from 2017 to 2018 the number of applicants increased to 1,091 (66% increase). The highest number of applicants with domestic violence codes by local government area and corresponding growth rates from 2016 to 2018 include Brisbane City Council (197%), Moreton Bay Regional Council (95%), Cairns Regional Council (183%), Logan City Council (352%), and Gold Coast City Council (547%). Further analysis of the housing register statistics include:

- 93.5% of total applicants from 2016 to 2018 are female
- 25.8% of total applicants from 2016 to 2018 identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander
- 30.2% of total applicants from 2016 to 2018 identifies as having a disability.\(^{89}\)

---

\(^{88}\) Vignettes provided by DESBT, March 2019

\(^{89}\) A household is classified as being a 'Disability' household when at least one member listed on the application requires home modifications due to a disability; and/or, receives a disability type income from Centrelink; and/or has a disability indicated on their housing needs assessment.
Similarly, bond loans and rental grants have increased for applicants experiencing domestic and family violence between 2016 and 2018. Key measures of the dataset assess applicants by location, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status, and gender. The number of loan and grant applicants from 2016 to 2017 increased from 746 to 3,239 (334%) and from 2017 to 2018 the number of applicants increased to 4,220 (30%). The highest number of applicants by local government area and corresponding average year-on-year growth rates from 2016 to 2018 include Gold Coast City Council (598%), Logan City Council (567%), Moreton Bay Regional Council (644%), Brisbane City Council (682%), and Ipswich City Council (336%). From 2016 to 2018, most applicants (89.8%) were female and 15.4% identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.

Bond loans and rental grants and social rental housing applicant data also shows a concentration of demand in the south-east corner of Queensland. While this could be driven by population, it will also be important for the Queensland Government to ensure this is not indicative of lower understanding of housing services available to those experiencing domestic and family violence in regional and remote Queensland.
9.5.3 Counselling Services

Counselling services are an integral part of the support services offered to domestic and family violence victim survivors. Chart 9.15 displays the number of domestic and family violence counselling service users with cases closed/finalised as a result of most of identified needs being met. As of 2017–18, there were 27,782 users with closed cases due to all needs being met; an increase of more than 7,000 users, or 34% from 2015–16 to 2017–18. There is no information about what needs are being met, and if there are any service needs gaps.

“After surviving 23 years of domestic violence and fleeing to a refuge, I started getting counselling to help me. This is when I went into a meltdown, blaming myself for taking so long to leave. The truth is I wasn’t strong enough due to the emotional and mental abuse I had suffered and my isolation from family and friends”. 
Review of the Second Action Plan

Chart 9.15 Number of domestic and family violence counselling service users with cases closed/finalised as a result of most identified needs being met, 2015-16 to 2017-18

Source: DCSYW administrative data provided by DCSYW

For more information on how victim survivors from vulnerable population groups are having their needs met, see chapter 12.

Chart 9.16 shows that most of the Service Provider Survey respondents felt there were insufficient accommodation services to meet demand. This aligns with the results from the survey administered by Acil Allen in 2017, where 89% of the 44 respondents reported there was insufficient supported housing to meet demand and 82% reported there was insufficient temporary supported housing. Given the increasing demand for these services and counselling support, it may be worth further investigation into the service sector’s capacity to meet this demand.
Chart 9.16 Survey question: ‘Please choose the option that best describes the ability of services to meet current demand across service types. This question relates to your impressions of the sector broadly, and not your experience of your organisation alone’ (n = 24), 2019

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Deloitte Service Provider Survey data
10 Supporting outcome six

To what extent have perpetrators stopped using violence and are they held to account?

Key findings

Justice system initiatives have been implemented to hold perpetrators to account. Of particular note, the evaluation of the Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court Trial in Gold Coast identified promising early outcomes in terms of victim survivors feeling the justice system had held perpetrators to account. The number of intervention orders issued by Queensland courts to require perpetrators’ attendance of a program or counselling to address their behaviour tripled from 2015 to 2017.

Results are mixed as to whether there has been an uptake in perpetrators accessing services or whether perpetrators have reduced their use of domestic and family violence as a result of the reforms. The 2017 Annual Highlights Card reports a 92% increase in the number of perpetrators using services, however this is not reflected in the perspectives of service providers.

In the future, it will be important to improve understanding of the extent to which perpetrators are taking responsibility for their actions. This will require improving the approach to data collection and evaluation to better track implementation, progress and outcomes, and should take into consideration how program design, delivery and outcomes may differ for perpetrators from diverse populations. In regional and remote areas, it has been noted that current perpetrator services and providers are underrepresented, and to make a further impact, these services should become more involved in the integrated service response. Part of the underrepresentation is attributable to geographical challenges, but funding constraints were also highlighted as a barrier to existing perpetrator providers participating.

Note: This section makes several references to the evaluation of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial, conducted by Griffith University. This is an evaluation of the trial, which was run between 1 September 2015 and 30 June 2017. The permanent Southport permanent Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court opened on 19 October 2017. This section uses the following definitions:

- Perpetrator interventions – refers to a range of interventions that seek to hold perpetrators to account and take responsibility for their behaviour. This includes perpetrator programs aimed at changing behaviour delivered by corrections and the community sector and broader system supports such as court, corrections and police responses.
- Government funded perpetrator program responses – programs that are delivered to perpetrators of domestic and family violence that are government-funded and are focused on changing perpetrator behaviour.


“The tools I’m getting ... I’ve never had these tools before ... how to react and how to act out towards my partner ... if I had those tools back in July of this year I wouldn’t be sitting here talking to you guys.”

- Perpetrator from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court. Griffith University
10.1 Objectives of supporting outcome six
Supporting outcome six focuses on holding perpetrators to account and stopping their use of violence. Specifically, the Second Action Plan states this outcome, over the course of the Strategy, is seeking to achieve:

- Systems are in place to ensure perpetrators receive appropriate sanctions and access to assistance to stop using violence.
- Respectful relationships and the right for every person to live free from violence is modelled and expected everywhere people live, learn, work and play.
- Supports are available for both victim survivors and perpetrators to remove themselves from situations of potential violence.
- Perpetrators are provided the education and tools for dealing with problems without resorting to violence. Systems are in place to ensure perpetrators receive appropriate sanctions and access to culturally appropriate assistance to stop using violence.92

Within supporting outcome six, there are 15 actions, all of which fall under the implementing domain of four agencies: QPS, DJAG, DCSYW and QCS.

The following evaluation questions for intermediate outcomes drive the evaluation of whether the actions enacted as part of the Second Action Plan are meeting the objectives of supporting outcome six:93

- Has the Strategy helped build a more seamless and integrated service response that meets the needs of perpetrators?
- To what extent have services to perpetrators been accessible?
- To what extent have perpetrators shown an improved understanding that their violence is a problem?
- How effective have integrated services been in enabling perpetrators to overcome their domestic violence?
- To what extent has the capacity of individuals working in perpetrator interventions been developed to respond to the dynamics and impacts of domestic and family violence?

Accountability can be interpreted from two perspectives—systems and policies holding a perpetrator accountable (such as the legal system), and the perpetrator themselves understanding the impact of their offending behaviour, taking responsibility, and changing their behaviour. Perpetrator interventions are the systems in place to hold perpetrators to account. Government-funded perpetrator programs focus on changing perpetrator attitudes and behaviour.

10.2 System-level perpetrator interventions
There is evidence to show that a range of actions that relate to holding perpetrators to account through system interventions have been delivered or commenced, including:

- Introducing legislation to give effect to the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme
- Revised eligibility criteria for custodial programs to ensure access to therapeutic programs and other interventions for those sentenced for less than 12 months for domestic and family violence offences
- Exploring use of electronic monitoring of perpetrators in a range of criminal law contexts
- Roll-out of specialist domestic and family violence courts in Southport,Beenleigh and Townsville, and court circuits in Palm Island and Mount Isa.

---

10.2.1 Queensland Police Service responses

Improving reporting of domestic and family violence to police is an important and necessary element in breaking the cycle of domestic and family violence. Queensland police attendances to domestic and family violence has increased by 3.2%, from 87,102 to 89,927 from 2015–16 to 2017–18 (Chart 10.1).

Chart 10.1 QPS attended domestic and family violence-related matters\textsuperscript{94} 2015–16 to 2017–18

The number of reported breaches\textsuperscript{95} of DVOs has also increased over the course of the Second Action Plan (Chart 10.2). It is important to note that this includes interstate attendance, which only came into effect in 2018. Overall growth in reported breaches of DVOs appears to be reasonably consistent at the regional level, however there is variability in growth within these regions. For example, all sub-regions except for the northern Queensland regions of Mount Isa and Townsville, and the central Queensland region of Mackay have shown growth in DVO breaches reported in the three years to 2017–18.

\textsuperscript{94} A police attendance is where police attend an incident which may involve a domestic and family violence investigation whereby a contravention of a DVO, Police Protection Notice, Temporary Protection Order or release conditions is reported, or an initial report or other criminal investigation occurs

\textsuperscript{95} A reported breach refers to the report or contravention of a DVO or Police Protection Notice refers to the reporting of the event on QPRIME which is investigated by Queensland police. These may be reported by the aggrieved, a witness or police, and are investigated by Queensland police. At the conclusion of the investigation or where evidence exists, the respondent may be charged with a contravention of a DVO, Police Protection Order or Temporary Protection Order at which time the charges are lodged to the Magistrates Court.
Chart 10.2 Reported breaches of domestic and family violence orders 2015–16 to 2017–18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Queensland Police Service Region and District Crime Statistics 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2018. Note: regional groupings are based on the QPS regional groups.

When responding to domestic and family violence, if police suspect that the victim survivor needs further protection, they have the ability to apply for a protection notice on behalf of the victim survivor. In addition, if they believe that this protection is urgent, police can apply for a temporary protection notice which is immediately enforceable. They also have obligations to investigate, record keeping responsibilities and other responsibilities under the Act s100.

The number of finalised protection order application applied for by police has remained relatively stable over the period 2015–16 to 2017–18. There were 21,799 in 2015–16, 22,125 in 2016–17 and 21,355 in 2017–18. This represents an aggregate decline of 2% over the three years. This may be due to the extension of the expiry on DVOs, which increased to up to five years in November 2017 (previously they lasted one-two years). This decline may also be associated with the increase in breaches.

Lodging contraventions of DVOs is an important mechanism through which perpetrators are held to account for their behaviour. The number of contraventions of DVOs lodged with the Magistrates Court has increased slightly. In 2017-18 there were 19,994 contravene DVO charges lodged, equating to a 5% increase in 2017-18 compared to the number lodged in 2015-16.

Satisfaction with police response to domestic and family violence.
Victim survivor satisfaction with police responses is an important indicator that the police are ensuring victim survivors’ needs are being met, as well as the degree of trust felt by victim survivors in the system to keep them safe from harm.

---

96 DJAG data from QWIC. This includes police urgent temporary protection order application, domestic violence general applications, domestic violence protection order applications, domestic violence register interstate orders and policy protection notices.
Results from the Queensland Crime Victim Survey indicates the majority of domestic and family violence victim survivors are satisfied with their interactions with Queensland police. Overall, satisfaction levels are relatively high, with an estimated 60.7% of victim survivors recording a satisfied experience regarding the police response to a reported DVO breach, 70.8% satisfied with their experience of police during the DVO application process, and 76.0% satisfied with their experience of a police referral (Chart 10.3). It is important these results are interpreted cautiously, due to limitations in sample size and records.97

Nonetheless, the results also indicate further scope for improvement, particularly as it relates to domestic and family violence breaches. Nearly one in four victim survivors are estimated to be dissatisfied with their domestic and family violence breach and application related interactions with Queensland police. Understanding why these victim survivors feel this way will enable identification of any systemic barriers that could be overcome to ensure their needs are being met.

Chart 10.3 Queensland domestic and family violence victim survivor satisfaction with services provided by Queensland police, 2016 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence breach</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and family</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence application</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and family</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence referral</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crime Victims Survey 2016 and 2018 provided by Queensland Government Statistician’s Office, Queensland Treasury. Sample size of 594 in 2016 and 514 in 2018. Note: A small sample size limits the representativeness of the sample and therefore results should be interpreted with caution. The number of victims included in the pool of potential participants was much lower in 2018 than 2016 and therefore caution should be taken when making comparisons between these years.

97 There were two main limitations to the Crime Victims Survey 2018 that impact upon the data 1) small sample size and 2) the removal of large numbers of domestic and family violence records in 2018 to limit the risk of re-victimisation. Although there are enough records for estimates to be representative at the state level, estimates are less reliable when reporting on specific types of victims. Caution should be used when interpreting the domestic and family violence results from the 2018 survey and when comparing the estimates between 2016 and 2018.
There are some indications of differences in the overall satisfaction with services provided by the Queensland Police Service for some population groups, although the differences are not statistically significant (Chart 10.4). Overall, female victim survivors, which accounts for approximately 74% of the estimated proportion of victim survivors who come to the attention of Queensland police, tend to be more satisfied overall with services provided by Queensland police than victim survivors between the ages of 35–54 years. There is no indication as to why this is the case. These differences should be monitored over time to determine if they are indicative of a broader issue.

Chart 10.4 Queensland domestic and family violence victim survivor overall satisfaction with services provided by Queensland police, disaggregated by gender and age, 2018


Police referrals for domestic and family violence victim survivors and perpetrators

As a frontline agency, police officers play an important role in linking victim survivors and perpetrators to support services through referrals. Chart 10.5 shows the number of police referrals for domestic and family violence offences attended by police. This includes all individual referrals to all services – accepted and declined – made for domestic and family violence occurrences. There were 71,844 domestic and family violence related referrals offered against domestic and family violence occurrences in 2018. This was an increase from 30,987 referrals offered in 2016 and 57,717 referrals offered in 2017 (Chart 10.5.a). This increase is likely due to the updated police referrals system, launched in December 2015 and referrals from QPRIME available from May 2016.

The growth in police referrals has been distributed evenly across aggrieved, respondents, and other people (referrals associated with the occurrence) with aggregate growth of 131% and 141% and 133% respectively since 2016 (Chart 10.5.a). There was slightly faster growth in respondent referrals issued by police compared to the growth in referrals for victim survivors. This does however need to be interpreted cautiously as it contains non-domestic and family violence referrals against domestic and family violence occurrences. In 2018, 52.2% of aggrieved accepted police referrals on domestic and family violence occurrences, compared to only 37.2% of respondents.
The aggrieved are more likely to receive police referrals on occurrences than a respondent. In 2018, 48.7% of police referrals were for the aggrieved, compared to 34.2% for the respondent. As females are more represented in the aggrieved cohort, they were also more likely to receive a police referral. Women accounted for 57% of police referrals. The distribution of referrals across aggrieved and respondents who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander was consistent with the distribution of referrals across the non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population (Chart 10.5.b).

Chart 10.5 Number of police referrals on domestic and family violence occurrences, 2016 to 2018 (a) and distribution of referrals, 2018 (b)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using List of Referrals on occurrences with a domestic violence incident/offence, Queensland, 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018 provided by Queensland Police Service.
The proportion of people who receive a police referral and identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander has increased slightly over time (Chart 10.6). As of 2018, there were 20,487 police referrals to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, accounting for 28.5% of all police referrals (Chart 10.6)

Chart 10.6 Number of police referrals on occurrences with a domestic and family violence offence for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people 2016 to 2018

An increase in police referrals has been seen throughout the state between 2016 and 2018 (Chart 10.7). While most police referrals were issued in the Brisbane regions (north Brisbane and south Brisbane) and central Queensland police district region of Capricornia, growth from 2016 to 2018 has been largest in a number of notable districts that have been a focus of the Strategy to date. These regions include Townsville (535%), Logan (458%), Gold Coast (279%) and Mount Isa (148%). Growth has been slowest in the regions of South West (43%) and Wide Bay Burnett (31%). However, all regions have outpaced the growth rate of QPS attended domestic and family violence related matters from 2015–16 to 2017–18 (3.2%) suggesting that, compared to 2016, police were more likely to issue a referral when they attended a domestic and family violence occurrence in 2018.

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using List of Referrals on occurrences with a DV incident/offence, Queensland, 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018 provided by Queensland Police Service.
Chart 10.7 Proportion of police referrals on occurrences with a domestic and family violence offence by district, 2018 (RHS) and change of police referrals by QPS District, 2016 to 2018 (LHS)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using List of Referrals on occurrences with a DV incident/offence, Queensland, 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018 provided by Queensland Police Service.

There have been some changes in the types of referrals issued by police to victim survivors and perpetrators between 2016 and 2018 (Chart 10.8 and Chart 10.9). The data shows that for both victim survivors and perpetrators, there has been a shift to personal counselling referrals, which has been largely offset by a decline in alcohol/drug misuse referrals. Given there has been a simultaneous increase in the proportion of victim survivors who report being satisfied or very satisfied with police referrals, this may suggest an improvement in the appropriateness of referrals for victim survivors. It will be important to understand the appropriateness of these referrals, whether these are contributing to better outcomes for victim survivors and perpetrators, and track trends in referral behaviour.
Chart 10.8 Types of police referrals on occurrences with a domestic and family violence offence for victim survivors, 2016 and 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using List of Referrals on occurrences with a DV incident/offence, Queensland, 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018 provided by Queensland Police Service. Note: over 70% of referrals per year do not have an adequate description. Therefore, only approximately 30% of referral data is analysed (2016n = 3,512 unique referrals, 2018n = 7,906 unique referrals). Unique occurrences can have multiple referral types.

Chart 10.9 Types of police referrals on occurrences with a domestic and family violence offence for perpetrators, 2016 and 2018

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using List of Referrals on occurrences with a DV incident/offence, Queensland, 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018 provided by Queensland Police Service. Note: over 70% of referrals per year do not have an adequate description. Therefore, only approximately 30% of referral data is analysed (2016n = 3,512 unique referrals, 2018n = 7,906 unique referrals). Unique occurrences can have multiple referral types.
an adequate description. Therefore, only approximately 30% of referral data is analysed (2016n= 2,907 unique referrals, 2018n= 6,223 unique referrals). Unique referrals can have multiple referral types.

10.2.2 Queensland courts
Queensland courts have also issued more intervention orders in 2017–18 than were recorded in 2016–17 and 2015–16. Intervention orders require perpetrators to attend a program or counselling to address their behaviour.\(^{98}\) Intervention orders from 2015–16 to 2017–18 have increased from 616 to 1,088. The Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court and Beenleigh have been the main contributors to this increase in intervention orders.

Chart 10.10 The number of intervention orders made in Queensland, 2015–16 to 2017–18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using domestic and family violence intervention orders data provided by DJAG. The full 2018 calendar data was unavailable and so excluded from this analysis

Evidence from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court evaluation\(^9\) suggests progress is being made. The evaluation, undertaken by Griffith University, found that 45% of victim survivor participants agreed or strongly agreed that the perpetrator was held responsible for their behaviour by the Magistrate, compared to 39% in the comparison court. Those working at the court felt the specialist nature, especially specialist magistrates, contributed to holding perpetrators to account.

The extent to which perpetrators themselves take responsibility for their actions is unclear. Fifty-four per cent of perpetrator participants in the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court agreed or strongly agreed their behaviour needed to change (compared to approximately 22% at the comparison site). At both the trial site and comparison site, approximately one quarter of victim survivors (26% and 25% respectively) agreed the perpetrator had taken responsibility for their behaviour.

**The voices of victim survivors**

"Violence was normalised in my partner’s upbringing. I took a long time documenting the evidence of the history of domestic and sexual violence against me. It took over 2 and a half years to go to trial. By the time we went to trial, the DVO had expired – I didn’t want to go to court because I might see him there.

His defence cited an unrelated case as precedent for his history of DV to be inadmissible in the prosecutor’s case. The history of his DV offending had disappeared from the system – I tried to escalate to ethical standards, but they didn’t listen. The text messages I had received and the police officer had opened and read, the officer forgot about when giving evidence. My internal injuries from sexual violence were categorised as resulting from endometriosis.

The trial was in March. He was found not guilty. I had a male judge, a male defence lawyer, and a mostly male jury. What chance did I have?"

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.

### 10.3 Government funded perpetrator programs

There are 14 organisations funded by DCSYW to deliver intervention programs in community settings across 29 locations (see Appendix N for further detail). Actions progressed under the Second Action Plan in response to perpetrators of domestic and family violence include:

- Updated practice standards for perpetrator interventions
- Four-year trial of Walking with Dads\(^10\)
- Expansion of perpetrator programs, including additional community-based programs, and the trial of programs delivered in three correctional centres
- Targeted work of CJGs in developing perpetrator responses for local needs and contexts, with support from CIP (DJAG).

There is mixed evidence of the uptake and outcomes achieved by government-funded perpetrator programs to change perpetrator behaviour and hold perpetrators to account. Chart 10.11 shows there has been a year-on-year increase in the number of perpetrators who voluntarily\(^11\) access perpetrator programs or related services funded by the DCSYW, almost tripling from 2015–16 to

---


\(^10\) Walking with Dads (WWD) is a program developed by DCSYW, equipping those who work in child protection with tools to better address cases where harm is caused primarily by fathers. The program also assists fathers to take responsibility for the harm their actions have caused. WWD underwent a four-year trial where a specialist worker was placed in Child Safety Service Centres operating in Caboolture, Caloundra and Gympie since October 2016, and Mount Isa since February 2017.

\(^11\) Perpetrator programs refer to intervention programs offering treatment and education for perpetrators of domestic and family violence. They aim to prevent violence by changing attitudes and behaviour. Programs can be court mandated or voluntary but in Australia the majority of programs are voluntary (Source: Australian Attorney-General’s Department. (2010). AVERT Family Violence: Collaborative Responses in the Family Law System).
2017-18. The growth in service users of perpetrator programs is likely to be partly caused by increased funding, enabling service providers to provide for unmet demand for perpetrator programs. The volume of service users participating in perpetrator programs in an involuntary capacity is not known, including DCSYW and QCS funded programs and the QCS trial in correctional centres.

Chart 10.11 Number of service users of perpetrator programs, 2015–16 to 2017–18

The increase in uptake of perpetrator programs is in contrast to the overall decline in Mensline clients since 2015–16. The overall decline in Mensline clients is comprised of a large decline in the number of perpetrators voluntarily calling Mensline, partially balanced by an increase in police referrals to Mensline between 2015–16 and 2017–18 (see Chart 10.12). This decline in clients looks to be largely concentrated in the Brisbane, Sunshine Coast and broader South East Queensland region (see Chart 5.7). However, there is no available evidence to explain this decline in Mensline clients in these regions.

Chart 10.12 Change in callers to Mensline clients by caller type, 2015-16 to 2017-18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using DVConnect intake data provided by DCSYW
While there is evidence that perpetrator programs have been implemented, it is important to understand if these programs have been effective in achieving their intended outcomes. That is, influencing perpetrators so they change their attitudes, beliefs and ultimately behaviours. High-level indicators of perpetrator rehabilitation collected for reporting in the Annual Highlights Cards indicates that these programs may be having some impact on the behaviours of perpetrators. The DCSYW collects data from NGOs on the number of perpetrator program service users the NGO identifies as reducing their use of domestic and family violence. According to this data (noting it is not validated), there has been an increasing number of perpetrators who NGOs report are reducing their behaviour – from 1,533 to 3,629 from 2015–16 to 2017–18.\(^2\) This should however be treated cautiously, as there is no indication of what it means to have ‘reduced their use of domestic and family violence’, or if the proportion of perpetrators using services that have decreased their use of domestic and family violence has increased.

This is inconsistent with findings from the Service Provider Survey conducted by Deloitte Access Economics (see Chart 10.13), finding that only 50% of respondents agreed with the statements that:

- the reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services by perpetrators
- the reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by perpetrators, and
- perpetrators are better able to have their needs met.

Of note, the distribution in the responses is large, with two questions receiving responses ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘strongly agree’. This suggests a high degree of difference/diversity in service providers’ perceptions of victim survivors’ confidence in the success of perpetrator interventions. It also shows that the median response was disagreement that victim survivors are confident in the success of perpetrator interventions, mirroring results from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court evaluation, conducted by Griffith University, in which only one quarter of victim survivors reportedly agreed that perpetrators had taken responsibility for their behaviour. This may reflect why service providers reported lower levels of agreement that victim survivors feel safe.

\(^2\) This estimate relies on self-reporting from government-funded NGOs. As this service usage data provided by DCSYW is not inclusive of all service providers, only those self-reported, these figures may underestimate the actual number of perpetrator program service users.
Chart 10.13 Service providers level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland Domestic and Family violence reforms have led to changes in perpetrators taking responsibility for their behaviour, where 1=strongly disagree and 10=strongly agree (n=23), 2019

Q2: 5 The Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services for perpetrators of domestic and family violence

Q2: 6 The Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by perpetrators of domestic and family violence

Q2: 7 Perpetrators of domestic and family violence are better able to have their needs met because of the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms

Q2: 8 Victims are confident in the success of perpetrator interventions

Q2: 9 The Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to behaviour change among perpetrators of domestic and family violence

Further data is required to understand the outcomes interventions are achieving to both hold perpetrators to account, and to address the causes of their offending behaviour. This is particularly important since the focus of the supporting outcome to date has been on the justice system holding perpetrators to account. Of the 15 actions, only three are linked solely to supporting outcome six, while the remainder are also linked to supporting outcome seven relating to the justice system. This suggests there may be an opportunity in the future for increased focus on perpetrator interventions so perpetrators take responsibility for their behaviour and ultimately seek to reduce the severity and frequency of their violent behaviour.

This is not without its challenges, such as acknowledging the gaps in evidence about the long-term effectiveness of programs, applicability of interventions in diverse cohorts, and supply of appropriately skilled personnel to deliver interventions. Steps are being taken in this regard, including a service sector profile being conducted by DCSYW to improve understanding of existing capability, service demand, approach to triaging applications, and gaps. For services funded to deliver men’s domestic and family violence perpetrator intervention initiatives across Queensland, undertaking a sector-wide collection of service level data (using a consistent tool) will provide a clear overview of Queensland’s current service system for perpetrator programs, which is comparable across a range of common factors. This will gauge sector readiness for future quality framework and evaluation activities, including what current baseline data is available, what defined program logics are in place and how outcomes are currently measured.
11 Supporting outcome seven

Does the justice system deal effectively with domestic and family violence?

Key findings:

Available data provides evidence that there are improvements in the policing and prosecuting of domestic and family violence and improvements in support systems available for victims and perpetrators entering the justice system for domestic and family violence. At a high level, homicides associated with domestic and family violence have been declining, while DVO breaches have been increasing.

There have been a range of activities undertaken to improve justice system responses to domestic and family violence. However the complexity and long-term nature of reform in the justice system means that system-level outcomes are likely to manifest over a longer period. The CIP, CJG initiatives and Domestic and Family Violence Specialist Court are all examples of progress occurring at particular sites throughout Queensland.

In 2017–18, 561 (90%) Magistrate’s court registry staff members had received professional development on domestic and family violence from 793 training sessions, up from 85% of staff members in 2015-16 and 2016–17. In addition there were 37 additional domestic and family violence duty lawyers training in 2017–18 (down from 87 in 2016–17) and 262 solicitors trained.

In rural and remote areas, it was reported that there was a lack of domestic and family violence expertise and specialties within the regional justice services, which contributed to a lack in accountability of the justice system and perpetrator services. Community Justice Groups are leading a range of responses intended to benefit Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, however, it is too early to tell if these actions have contributed to reductions in domestic and family violence. The data shows that there have been a number of actions taken by CJGs to improve their capacity, including an increase in recruitment and training. In 2017–18, there were 1,687 community members who have received support from CJGs for domestic and family violence. This has resulted in an increase in services provided to support victim survivors and perpetrators.

^Trends in homicides related to domestic and family violence should be treated with caution. Year-on-year changes in Homicides are volatile and should be analysed over five year periods to account for this volatility. There is no substantiated evidence to indicate that the Second Action Plan, or broader Strategy, has had any causal impact on the observed trends.
“If you look solely at the process for obtaining a domestic and family violence order it is simple.

- Experience domestic and family violence.
- An application is filled in and submitted.
- Court date given.
- A Magistrate reviews the application.
- If the application describes domestic and family violence as per the legislation you’re granted an order.
- A breach occurs—now what?
- The judicial system seeks evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.
- Structures and resources to obtain that evidence are insufficient.
- Victims become re-traumatised.
- No conviction is obtained.
- This sends a message to perpetrators that they can continue perpetrating violence.
- It’s time to challenge the way it’s always been done.

It’s time to re-create those structures and provide safe environments for our futures. ”

- Victim survivor, DFVI Progress Report 2017–18
11.1 Objective of supporting outcome seven
An integral part of the Strategy is to impact the ability of the Queensland justice system to protect victim survivors including those affected by domestic and family violence, discourage and penalise perpetrators, and to improve its ability to meet the needs of the diverse Queensland population.

Supporting outcome seven aims to contribute to foundational element three—establishing a stronger justice system that will prioritise victim survivor safety and hold perpetrators to account. The justice system responds to domestic and family violence in two key ways. Firstly, it attempts to prevent further domestic and family violence by issuing DVOs. Secondly, it aims to address domestic and family violence through the issuing of DVOs, imposing respondents to undertake an intervention order or issuing penalties upon finding or plea of guilty for a domestic and family violence offence.

The 'Not Now, Not Ever' Report identified a number of needs-gaps in the system that are inhibiting the effectiveness through which the justice system can achieve these objectives. The report put forward 50 recommendations to address these issues through a number of activities, including the establishment of specialist domestic and family violence courts, guidelines and frameworks for magistrates and lawyers, and a host of recommendations to improve the accessibility of the justice system to victim survivors.

Under the Second Action Plan, the Queensland Government is implementing 27 individual actions to improve the ability of the justice system to address domestic and family violence incidences. These actions align to 27 recommendations produced in the 'Not Now, Not Ever' Report. The aim of these actions are:

- The system is safe, fair, supportive, efficient and effective.
- Victims are kept safe leading up to, during and after court and justice system journeys. Victims are heard and their views respected. Courts understand the trauma victim survivors endure and the impact on their confidence and ability to communicate this experience.
- Perpetrators are assisted to understand that their behaviour is unacceptable. Perpetrators are provided with the supports and assistance needed to choose a non-violent path and learn how to foster healthy, respectful relationships.

This analysis seeks to measure progress against the overarching supporting outcome by answering the following seven evaluation questions for intermediate outcomes:

- How effective has the justice system process been in providing coordinated, consistent and timely responses to domestic and family violence matters?
- To what extent has the justice system been supported to provide comprehensive and integrated services that meet the needs of perpetrators, victim survivors and their families?
- To what extent have victim survivors been kept safe leading up to, during and after court?
- How effective has the justice system process been in implementing actions to hold perpetrators accountable for their actions?
- To what extent have Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perpetrators, victim survivors and their families shown an increased understanding of and confidence in the process?
- How have Community Justice Groups in 18 discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities demonstrated an increased capability to support and respond to domestic and family violence?
- How effective has the Strategy been in supporting local justice authority structures to respond to domestic and family violence?

11.2 Increasing access to and effectiveness of the justice system

An area of the justice system identified by the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report as needing reform is access to the justice system. The ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report particularly noted the complexities of the system, including lengthy DVO forms and the lack of available support to navigate through the court system, especially for linguistically diverse populations. To address these issues, the Queensland Government has undertaken a number of initiatives, as outlined in the case study in Appendix P.

DVO applications

The voices of victim survivors

“Completing the DVO application in late 2018 was the biggest challenge I had. I’m an educated person with years of experience in the public sector and I couldn’t figure it out. The staff at the DV service said they couldn’t help me to complete it. I then got a referral to Women’s Legal Service, and the lawyer helped me complete it. They spent time with me to take my details, and help me with the form – they were gentle and considerate. They went to the court to lodge the application, and arranged an urgent closed hearing. The hearing was held that day, 2 hours later. Women’s Legal Service also provided an Indigenous Liaison Officer, giving support for me to be seen and heard as an Indigenous woman.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.

The number of finalised DVO forms submitted by victim survivors provides one indicator of the effectiveness of changes to the DVO application process, and is shown in Chart 11.1. It is useful to view this data in six month periods due to the cyclical nature of DVO form applications. The data shows that there has been no noticeable increase in DVO applications since 2015–16. Rather, there has been a slight decrease on year-on-year DVO applications filed. Particularly, there has been a slight decrease in applications submitted by victim survivors themselves as well as applicants filed by, or on behalf of, Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders from 2015–16 to 2017–18. There is no available evidence as to explain these data trends.
Timeliness of services
An important aspect of the effectiveness of the justice system is the timeliness in which it is able to meet the needs of victim survivors. To date, there have been a number of significant reforms to improve the outcomes of the justice system with regards to domestic and family violence in a timely manner. This has included the establishment of specialist domestic and family violence courts, the development of best practice guidelines and professional development materials for magistrates and lawyers, and increased access to interpreters in justice processes.

The number of DVO applications finalised within an acceptable time standard is an indicator in the evaluation framework as a measure of the effectiveness of the justice system in meeting the needs of victim survivors in a timely manner. The 2018 Annual Highlights Report Card states ‘reasonable time standard is six months from the date the application is lodged with the court’.

The evidence shows that the average length of time for approval has increased from 2015–16 to 2017–18 (see Chart 11.2). This is consistent across all types of DVO applications, the person who is applying, where they are applying, as well as across Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians.

While this data shows that over 90% of applications are approved within 180 days (time period considered by DJAG to be ‘reasonable’ based on the 2018 Annual Highlights card), the proportion of these being approved within this timeframe has nonetheless decreased by 2.5 percentage points
from 2015–16 to 2017–18. It may be important to continue to monitor this, including understanding the drivers for this. For example, timeliness can be impacted by the type of court response (i.e. whether a therapeutic jurisprudence approach is provided), the source of the application or whether there is intersection with other service systems such as child protection.

Chart 11.2 Average days from lodgement to approval of DVO applications and percentage of applications approved within 180 days, 2015–16 to 2017–18

Policing of domestic and family violence
Police are often the first interaction that a victim survivor or perpetrator has with the justice system, and play an important frontline role in ensuring that victim survivors are kept safe and perpetrators are held to account.

From 2017–18, there was a slight decline in domestic and family violence homicides. The 'Not Now, Not Ever' Report, identified that victim survivors were discouraged to report DVO breaches within the justice system, due to shortcomings stemming from complex processes and procedures. The increase in reported DVO breaches could represent positive progress if they are arising due to victim survivors being more willing to report breaches. Further monitoring and analysis may identify drivers for this, including whether victim survivors feel more empowered, or have more trust in police responses, to report breaches including through integrated service responses. Whether these changes can be attributed to it is however unknown.

Another important factor in domestic and family violence policing is data integrity and reporting, and its role in holding perpetrators to account; this includes factors such as ensuring all criminal charges are captured when attending DVO breaches and other domestic and family violence matters (e.g. physical assault or wilful damage of property), and appropriate evidence is collected and handled.

---

104 While there has been a decrease in the number of domestic and family violence related homicides across Queensland between 2016-17 and 2017-18, it is too early to know whether this is indicative of an ongoing trend or represents year-on-year changes. Care should be taken when analysing year of year data with small numbers.
properly. One example of where this is being addressed is the Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce (Gold Coast Taskforce); the Gold Coast Taskforce’s dedicated officers review all domestic and family violence cases to ensure data and information is complete and comprehensive, following up with attending officers regarding evidence, and to check for any flags of high-risk behaviours based on their specialist knowledge. This practice has resulted in an increase of criminal charges being recorded in domestic and family violence cases, and given the Gold Coast Taskforce more confidence in their data to identify perpetrator patterns of behaviour and inform decision making for local strategies.

**Court responses to domestic and family violence**

A responsive, fair and just court system is important in ensuring that domestic and family violence issues are addressed appropriately. A number of initiatives have been undertaken to improve the court process, and its understanding of domestic and family violence.

Specialist domestic and family violence courts offer one mechanism to deal exclusively with all civil and criminal domestic and family violence matters. A flagship evaluation of the initial trial of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court, released in February 2017, concluded that the original trial had been promising, with the results of a survey conducted shown in Chart 11.3.

**Chart 11.3 Survey outcomes of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial, 2017**

![Survey outcomes chart](image)

Source: Evaluation of the Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court Trial in Southport (2017)

The results show, that the needs of victim survivors were more likely to be met at the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court compared to Ipswich Court. This includes an improvement in both victim survivors reporting greater understanding of court outcomes, as well as a higher proportion of victim survivors agreeing that perpetrators were held to account. This is also highlighted through victim survivors’ experiences:

---

"Because it was the first time that I felt like someone was listening to me and realising what was going on and sort of believing me. All of that was a part of me coming to terms with what was going on, but it was the first time I felt like I had some type of support or belief or that everything wasn't just going X's way and that they reiterated over and over that it wasn't my fault ... And [DVPC] gave me instructions on how I could help myself, services I could get in contact with, you know like - yeah, it was a great relief to me. Because I was so stressed at the time. And they were just really calm and helpful and believed me, you know? Which was great, because - well I had only just started believing myself about it."

- Victim from the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court. Griffith University evaluation

Magistrates have participated in specific domestic and family violence training and conferences to support their professional development and learning. Most Magistrates Courts also take part in monthly domestic and family violence stakeholder meetings, demonstrating engagement in the issue of domestic and family violence. As of 2018, 32 of the 39 (89%) Magistrates Courts participated in these meetings to some degree.

As discussed in section 10.2, Queensland courts have also issued more intervention orders in 2017 than in 2015 and 2016. Growth in intervention orders from 2015 to 2017 has more than tripled, which has been largely concentrated in Southport. This is possibly evidence of the greater supportive role that the domestic and family violence specialist courts take on, which were trialled in the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court from 2015, before being formally established in 2017.

11.3 Specialist responses to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities

The issue of domestic and family violence requires a unique and culturally appropriate response in discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to be effective because of the unique cultural, economic and political circumstances of each of these areas. In response, the Queensland Government has allocated more than $11 million over four years to assist in building capacity of community justice groups (CJGs) in all 18 of Queensland’s discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to respond to domestic and family violence within their communities. The Courts Innovation Program team in DJAG is working closely with each of the CJGs to support them in a co-design process with their community to identify local needs, and develop tailored and feasible solutions, as well as providing support in planning implementation. Through the process so far, CJGs have identified a combination of needs for victim survivors in some communities, and perpetrators in other communities. In 2017–18, there were 1,687 community members who received support from CJGs for domestic and family violence.

The CJG capability building initiatives are still in progress and, therefore, it is too early to tell whether they have been effective. Chart 11.4 shows the number and type of victim survivor and perpetrator support services provided in 2017–18 by CJGs in Mornington Island, Mossman, Cherbourg, Wujal and Hope Vale.106

The data shows the number of services offered to victim survivors and perpetrators during 2017–18. Most services are offered to victim survivors and perpetrators to ensure they get the support they need, including assisting perpetrators to reintegrate into the community. However, there remains a need to improve domestic and family violence prevention responses in discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, and in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community as a whole.

106 DJAG has provided the data for these five CJGs.
Chart 11.4 Victim survivor and perpetrator support services provided by community justice groups, 2017-18

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using CJG information data provided by DJAG
12 Equity

To what extent has progress been made to address equity priorities for vulnerable population groups?

Key findings

More can be done to effectively meet the unique needs of the vulnerable population groups identified in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. Qualitative research unambiguously shows a greater need to focus on vulnerable populations, recognising the unique challenges and needs of different population groups.

There are differences in the gaps experienced by each identified group, meaning conclusions need to be drawn based on the needs of each group. For example, there is a strong need to continue developing the evidence base for people with disability, people in regional and remote areas and older people, while for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and people from CALD backgrounds more focus is needed on delivering culturally appropriate responses. Gaps in current domestic and family violence responses are varied, ranging from access to interpreter services for clients from CALD backgrounds to culturally appropriate responses for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, to understanding how to identify and appropriately respond to elder abuse.

Work has been undertaken to increase knowledge and understanding of domestic and family violence among these population groups. This includes conducting reviews to increase understanding of the prevalence of domestic and family violence experienced by diverse populations and undertaking communications campaigns aimed at vulnerable population groups to raise awareness.

Embedding capacity building into domestic and family violence specialist services has been a useful way to upskill the broader sector in working with the vulnerable population groups, but more work is required in this area. An example of where this has worked well has been through embedded officers, as per the DEAT case study. Establishing and strengthening partnerships between domestic and family violence services and other sector providers has also been mentioned as a tool that has worked well in addressing the specific and complex needs of vulnerable population groups.

Incorporating principles of co-design and community-led initiatives is important particularly for responses for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Stakeholders emphasised the need for responses to be co-designed by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to ensure cultural appropriateness and to account for concepts of violence that are unique to some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people’s experience of domestic and family violence should be considered in the context of historic systemic violence directed toward them.
The Second Action Plan set out to prevent and respond to domestic and family violence for all Queenslanders, including those from diverse population groups. This section presents the evaluation findings from an equity perspective, exploring the progress to date for populations identified in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report as being at greater risk of experiencing domestic and family violence. This includes Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people from CALD backgrounds, older people, rural and remote communities, people who identify as LGBTIQ, and people with disability.

12.1 Progress to date in the Second Action Plan for each vulnerable population group

While the Second Action Plan acknowledges vulnerable population groups, there has been variability in focus across these populations. Overall, the 84 actions from the Second Action Plan includes 18 actions that specifically target vulnerable population groups. These include five actions under foundational element one, six actions under foundational element two and seven actions under foundational element three. The breakdown of actions pertaining to each group, with some actions targeting more than one population group, is outlined in Chart 12.1, with further detail provided in Appendix E.

Chart 12.1 Actions targeting vulnerable population groups in the Second Action Plan

Note: The number exceeds the 18 actions since some actions included more than one population group
There is evidence that vulnerable population groups are overrepresented among those accessing domestic and family violence services. For example while non-Indigenous Australians accounted for 38% of accepted referrals for crisis accommodation in 2017–18 (n= 2,727), the distribution of the remaining accepted referrals was 38% for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and 24% for people from CALD backgrounds. This pattern was similar from 2015–16 to 2017–18.

Between 2015–16 and 2017–18, there were increases in clients to Womensline from CALD backgrounds and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and declines in clients to Mensline from these population groups. The percentages of new intake calls from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and clients from CALD backgrounds reached 8.7% and 12.6% respectively in 2017–18 (Chart 5.6). There is limited data to draw evidence based conclusions about the demand for services by other vulnerable population groups, including people who identify as LGBTIQ, older people, people living with disability and rural and remote communities. There is added complexity where intersections exist, for example where people with disability also come from CALD backgrounds.

Stakeholders recognised that vulnerable population groups often have unique and complex needs that may require flexibility in the system response to achieve equitable outcomes. Stakeholders commented that there has been some progress toward embedding system flexibility to better meet these needs. An example is the allocation of an embedded DCDSS officer in QPS (Gold Coast District) during the DEAT. Progress toward addressing outcomes is varied for individual population groups. Qualitative data from consultations and surveys also suggests more can be done to meet the needs of vulnerable population groups.

One area of focus under the Second Action Plan has been on raising awareness of behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence targeted toward particular population groups, to ensure they have the same level of understanding as the broader Queensland population. A focus has been on ensuring that this knowledge/increased awareness is tailored and communicated in appropriate ways. For example, the communications case study found consultation and co-design with target communities, selecting appropriate channels for delivering messages to target audiences, and tailoring messages, were all effective approaches for communicating information about domestic and family violence to vulnerable population groups. For example, the LGBTIQ campaign was informed by a community consultation process to capture relationship insights from more than 50 people who identify as LGBTIQ.

For older people
The focus of the Second Action Plan for older Queenslanders was to establish evidence regarding prevalence, raising community awareness, expanding services, and integrated service responses incorporating social and justice system supports. Establishing the prevalence of elder abuse has involved using statistics from the Elder Abuse Helpline and research commissioned to Curtin University. Other progress has included:

- expanding the capacity of the state-wide Elder Abuse Helpline to respond to more calls
- expanding Seniors Legal and Support services to regional areas of the state
- strengthening financial protections for seniors through new services in 10 locations
- working with all states and territories and the Commonwealth government to combat elder abuse by developing the National Plan to Respond to the Abuse of Older Australians (Elder Abuse) 2019–23.

Stakeholders noted that meeting the needs of older people affected by domestic and family violence requires collaboration across sectors and agencies, including government agencies, frontline police and health staff, as well as the aged care sector. Existing collaborative relationship between key agencies such as DCDSS and DCSYW have already supported this process.

Work has been undertaken to increase knowledge on the scale of domestic and family violence among older people and raising awareness of elder abuse within the Queensland population. This is evident from actions outlined in Appendix G, including the 2018 Elder Abuse Prevention and Awareness Campaign. The focus of this campaign was to increase awareness of what constitutes elder abuse, as well as ensuring older victim survivors know where to get help.
While work has been progressed to better understand prevalence of elder abuse, stakeholders reported this could be strengthened. They noted this requires a commitment to continue building the evidence base, including in sexual domestic and family violence, given this was identified as a potentially under-reported area among older Queenslanders. One mechanism stakeholders reported for building an understanding of elder abuse prevalence was through participating in the National Working Group. This may provide opportunities to leverage and identify research being carried out in other jurisdictions, and collaborate across jurisdictions.

There is evidence more people are seeking help for elder abuse. Data from the Elder Abuse Prevention Unit on calls to the Elder Abuse helpline shows that contacts have increased since 2000–01, outpacing the growth of the Queensland population aged 65 and over (Chart 12.2). For example, the number of contacts has increased from 1,529 to 1,651 from 2015–16 to 2016–17. Importantly, the Elder Abuse Prevention Abuse Unit reported it received 1,598 elder abuse calls during 2017, and that average monthly call volumes about elder abuse increased by 18% during the campaign period (June to September 2017).

Chart 12.2 Elder Abuse Helpline contacts, 2000-01 to 2016-17

Source: Elder Abuse Protection Unit Annual Report 2016-17. Population statistics were sourced from ABS cat. 3101.0 - Australian Demographic Statistics, Jun 2017

Elder Abuse Helpline callers per 1,000 persons aged 65 in each region shows that access to the Elder Abuse Helpline is fairly even across regions in Queensland (Chart 12.3). However, the growth in calls to the Elder Abuse Helpline has been most pronounced in remote areas such as South West and North West Queensland. In 2016–17, there were 58 calls (3.5% of the total) from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and 158 calls (or 9.6%) from Queenslanders from CALD backgrounds. It is difficult to draw inferences as to the representativeness of this as the rates of elder abuse among these population groups is unknown.

Financial and psychological abuse are the most common forms of elder abuse among older Queenslanders. The QSS found there were lower levels of knowledge among the Queensland population that financial abuse and psychological abuse constituted domestic and family violence.

107 The term ‘contacts’ refers to the initial contact made with the Elder Abuse Helpline by a person regarding an abuse situation. Calls sometimes include multiple victims and/or alleged perpetrators, meaning that the number of abuse records may be lower than the number of victims, alleged perpetrators, or abuse cases.

compared to other types of behaviours constituting domestic and family violence (see supporting outcome one). Findings from the Review into the Prevalence of Characteristics of Elder Abuse in Queensland found there is a lack of awareness that domestic and family violence also encompasses older people:

"I was talking to a family member and defined it as elder abuse but obviously, stemming from a domestic violence background, and the family member was saying to me, "Oh, I wouldn’t have really called it that...""

"...he’d been living in her home long-term and claiming the carer’s pension for her. She’s a woman in her 80s and she faked a heart attack. When the ambulance came she said, 'Look, I’m okay. Everything is fine. I’ve been a prisoner in my home for quite some time. I want to sell my house because I can’t live there any longer and care for myself. My son lives with me, but he doesn’t really do very much. I want to sell the house [but] he doesn’t want me to sell because it’s worth a lot of money and, as a result of that, I haven’t been allowed out of the house for the last several months. I’ve had no friends, no family. When people ring, he tells them I’m not available or I’m in the shower or something like that. And I’ve been a prisoner."

DEAT

Queensland police were called to a disturbance where an older person was abused verbally and financially by their grandchild. The grandchild, who in this case was the respondent, lived with their grandparent and had complex health issues including psychiatric disability.

There was an application submitted and completed for a domestic violence protection order. As a result, the grandchild was forced to leave the residence and admitted to a health facility. When the grandchild is released from this facility, the grandparent is happy for their grandchild to return to their residence. A safety plan was discussed with the older person, in preparation for their grandchild’s return.

This indicates there is progress to be made to shift knowledge and awareness among Queenslanders of the nature of domestic and family violence in this cohort, as a precursor to behaviour change. Achieving equitable outcomes under the reforms for older people experiencing domestic and family violence is dependent on the Queensland community being aware of the behaviours that constitute elder abuse and domestic and family violence and how to respond.

109 Focus group participant cited in ibid.
Chart 12.3 Recorded unique victim survivors who contacted the Elder Abuse Helpline per 1,000 residents aged 65 and older; 2012-13 and 2016-17

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using data from Elder Abuse Protection Unit Annual Reports, 2012-13 and 2016-17. Population statistics were sourced from ABS cat. 3235.0 – Regional population by age and sex, Australia, 2017. Note: changes in South West and North West regions are due to small population sizes in these regions.

Results from the Service Provider Survey suggest more work could be done to support older people experiencing domestic and family violence (see Chart 12.4). Overall respondents generally disagree there has been an increase in access to and uptake of services for older people, that older people are better able to have their needs met and that safety has improved. There is however a large distribution in responses, suggesting consensus varies.
Chart 12.4 Service providers reported level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland Domestic and Family violence reforms have met the needs of older people, 2019

For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people:
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people’s experience of domestic and family violence should be considered in the context of historic systemic violence directed toward them, including intergenerational trauma associated with dispossession of land, colonisation, removal of children from families and the Stolen Generation.\textsuperscript{111} As a consequence of this, an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander woman "may be unable or unwilling to fragment their identity by leaving the community, kin, family or partners" as a solution to the violence.\textsuperscript{112}

Stakeholders commented on the need for more culturally appropriate services including community-led initiatives and family healing. For example, consultations with stakeholders suggested more could be done to employ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in services providing support to victim survivors, to allow for culturally-appropriate responses and supports. This approach to providing more culturally appropriate responses was also identified in the 2016–17 Death Review and Advisory Board Annual Report.


Q3: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services for the following population groups. (n = 22)

Q4: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by following population groups. (n = 20)

Q5: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the following population groups are better able to have their needs met because of the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms. (n = 22)

Q6: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to improved safety for the following population groups. (n = 20)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using Deloitte designed Service Provider Survey
In May 2019, the Queensland Government released the ‘Queensland’s Framework for Action – Reshaping our approach to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander domestic and family violence’. This is the State Government’s response to Recommendation 20 of the Death Review and Advisory Board’s 2016–17 Annual Report regarding the development of a specific Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Family Violence Strategy as a matter of urgent priority. Guided by the foundational elements and supporting outcomes of the Strategy, this framework aims to achieve a vision of ‘A Queensland free from domestic and family violence’.

This response demonstrates the Queensland Government’s commitments toward addressing the issues of domestic and family violence among the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population, including:

- A commitment to a new way of working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, families and communities in the spirit of reconciliation
- A commitment to changing the way the government does business, and how they work in partnership and support Queensland’s First Nations families and communities to design, develop and deliver actions to address domestic and family violence.
- A commitment to continuing to listen and be guided by the voices of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and to working together to determine how to affect real change for families and communities.
- A commitment to working in partnership with communities.

Following eight core principles, the framework outlines the action plan between 2019 and 2021. The actions are grouped under four strategies:

1. Work in partnership with communities to use the knowledge and experience of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
2. Deliver programs and holistic wrap-around services that are stress and trauma informed, and culturally appropriate
3. Engage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and community controlled organisations to deliver the services needed
4. Improve our approach to monitoring and evaluating changes in outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families experiencing violence.113

Stakeholders consistently agreed on a need for domestic and family violence responses in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander context to be co-designed with, championed by and led by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. It was reiterated that where there may be an effective initiative to address domestic and family violence within the non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cohort, similar success may not necessarily apply to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population unless the initiative has been collaboratively designed with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This requires more than adapting resources to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander context, but involving them in the design to ensure responses are appropriate and take into account Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural and historical constructs.

---

Where community-led initiatives have been delivered under the Second Action Plan, responses have been positive. Examples include the CIP supporting the 18 CJGs in discrete communities to design and deliver local domestic and family violence responses appropriate for the needs of their communities. To date, funding has been provided to the communities of Mossman, Hope Vale, Wujal Wujal, Cherbourg, Woorabinda, Palm Island, Thursday Island, Coen and Mornington Island for their local responses. Each solution will be designed by the communities’ unique contexts, highlighting the importance of locally-led responses to meet local needs. Acknowledging there remain gaps in knowledge about outcomes of the initiative, there is an opportunity to improve understanding through learnings from the CJG flagship evaluation.

Findings from the Service Provider Survey indicates most providers are relatively neutral as to whether there has been an increase in access to and uptake of services, and whether there is improved safety, noting that some survey respondents may have had limited experience in working with this population group. Across all questions, 50% of responses fall within the slightly disagree and slightly agree range, showing variability in views (see Chart 12.5).

Chart 12.5 Service providers reported level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have met the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, 2019

Q3: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services for the following population groups. (n = 22)

Q4: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by following population groups. (n = 20)

Q5: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the following population groups are better able to have their needs met because of the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms. (n = 22)

Q6: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to improved safety for the following population groups. (n = 20)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis of Service Provider Survey, 2019
For people from CALD backgrounds, migrant and refugee backgrounds:
To achieve the goals of the Strategy for people from CALD backgrounds it is essential to recognise the unique needs of this population group, particularly the intersection across multiple service systems both inside and outside a domestic and family violence response. For example, consultations as part of the case study revealed that clients from CALD backgrounds, including from migrant and refugee backgrounds, face particular complexities that require a strong understanding of their specific needs and the services available. These client issues are often diverse and complex, ranging from visa and migration law matters, cultural differences, to different perceptions of social norms. Compounding these circumstances, clients from CALD backgrounds may encounter language barriers during their interaction with services. There are multiple points throughout a client journey that may discourage their pursuit or limit their options to escape violence.

Despite agreement on the importance of meeting the unique needs of clients from CALD backgrounds, service providers are generally neutral as to whether progress has been made, indicating more could be done (Chart 12.6), noting that some survey respondents may have had limited experience in working with this population group. Overall, there is variability in service providers’ level of agreement regarding the contribution of the domestic and family violence reforms. The median response for nearly all questions is around neutral, suggesting more could be done to support the needs of people from CALD backgrounds.

The voices of victim survivors

“I came to Australia because it’s a safe country. When I tried to seek help I was told I didn’t have enough evidence. I called the police and they found it difficult to understand me, and I wasn’t offered an interpreter, no one understood my culture.

My problems were ignored until my partner attempted to murder me. I was discharged from hospital, provided with a bus ticket to relocate to a new and completely foreign city to me, with my children. I was told to find a taxi to a hotel, the name provided on a piece of paper – I had no money, I didn’t know where I was, my kids were hungry and wanted food, and couldn’t speak English well. I finally got a referral to a case worker who worked with me to access the services I needed.”

These victim survivor stories have been collated from the Survivor ‘Open Conversation’ – Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council Event. All stories presented have been given with the permission of the victim survivors and de-identified.
Chart 12.6 Service providers reported level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland Domestic and Family violence reforms have met the needs of people from CALD backgrounds, 2019

Q3: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services for the following population groups. (n = 22)

Q4: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by following population groups. (n = 20)

Q5: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the following population groups are better able to have their needs met because of the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms. (n = 22)

Q6: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to improved safety for the following population groups. (n = 20)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis of Service Provider Survey, 2019

Speaking with service providers specialising in responses for clients from CALD backgrounds identified several enablers that could be implemented to better meet the needs of people from CALD backgrounds. This includes recruiting appropriately skilled workers, providing education to domestic and family violence mainstream services on the unique needs of clients from CALD backgrounds (including common issues and appropriate adjunct service referrals such as migration and visa services), and raising awareness of availability of funded interpreter services and processes of how to use them appropriately. Stakeholders consulted cited clients can be resistant to involve interpreters due to fear local community members, including perpetrators themselves, may be the interpreter used. There are clear ethical issues with these approaches and, as such, this highlights the importance of service provider knowledge to be able to facilitate access to available interpreter services (including telephone interpreters), and reassurance to clients that members of their direct community will not be involved.
Stakeholders also reported building capacity of domestic and family violence service providers to meet the needs of people from CALD backgrounds could be improved. While in some instances, it might be due to a client's preference to access a CALD-specific provider, in other cases the lack of cultural capability/competency of frontline staff acts as a barrier to help seeking behaviour. Stakeholders raised issues regarding a tendency for clients from CALD backgrounds to receive referrals to providers who were not able to appropriately respond to their needs, for example visa matters. In another example, stakeholders mentioned the high frequency and volume of calls that a specialist CALD service receive from mainstream service providers for advice regarding culturally appropriate responses. This could indicate a gap in capacity of the broader service system to respond to the needs of people with a CALD background. The DCSYW sector capability building project that is in its early stages has identified culturally-appropriate service capacity as a focus area.

Stakeholders also suggested that partnerships between domestic violence services and other sector providers (e.g. in migration law and housing) can assist in deepening the knowledge and broadening the experience in serving the needs of people with a CALD background. For example, a CALD-specific domestic and family violence service provider in Logan has a business relationships with a Refugee and Immigration Legal Service to provide legal service.

For people living in rural and remote communities:
While there have been examples of progress in meeting the needs of people living in remote and rural communities, more focus is required. The Service Provider Survey shows that 50% of respondents disagree with the statements regarding progress for people in regional and remote areas. This suggests focus may be warranted for this population group (Chart 12.7).

Stakeholder cited challenges in supporting domestic and family violence victim survivors and perpetrators living in rural and remote communities, include smaller volume of referral services available, distance between services, and the tightknit nature of communities. There are more limited options for services in rural and remote communities, compared to metropolitan areas. In the context of domestic and family violence, this can create challenges accessing safe housing, as to do so may require significant travel. Smaller communities can also pose challenges related to maintaining privacy and minimising contact with perpetrators. More work is need to understand how best to overcome these barriers facing those seeking services and support in regional and remote areas, recognising this may differ across geographical areas.

Challenges are compounded for people from vulnerable population groups who also reside in rural and remote areas. Stakeholders reported progress for older people and people with disability in rural and remote areas has been limited. Some communities stated there were few or no referrals for people from vulnerable population groups seeking assistance from rural or remotely-located service providers. This does not indicate people are not experiencing domestic and family violence, but rather, it may not be reported and referred.
Chart 12.7 Service providers reported level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland domestic and family violence reforms have met the needs of people in regional and remote areas, 2019

Q3: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services for the following population groups. (n = 22)

Q4: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by following population groups. (n = 20)

Q5: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the following population groups are better able to have their needs met because of the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms. (n = 22)

Q6: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to improved safety for the following population groups. (n = 20)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis of Service Provider Survey, 2019
For people with disability

There is an absence of data on the prevalence of domestic and family violence experienced by people with disability. Evidence of trends in violence more generally show that violence perpetrated against women and girls with disabilities is significantly more diverse in nature and more severe than for women in general. Compared to their peers, women with disabilities experience significantly higher levels of all forms of violence more intensely and frequently, are subjected to such violence by a greater number of perpetrators, and have considerably fewer pathways to safety. Violence has unique causes, takes on unique forms and results in unique consequences for people with disability; examples include controlling access to medication, mobility and communication supports, abuse of Powers of Attorney, and threats to withdraw care or institutionalise.

Given the absence of data, the focus under the Second Action Plan has been on understanding the prevalence and experiences of people with disability experiencing domestic and family violence. This is in light of the importance to build the evidence-base to ensure future actions are responsive to the needs and experiences of people with disability.

However, the progress to date has fallen short of advancing equity priorities for this population group. This was raised during consultations and reflected in the Service Provider Survey, where the fewest people agreed progress for people with disability had been made compared to all vulnerable population groups. In particular, more needs to be done to make people with disability feel safe.

Of note, stakeholders spoke about the importance of considering and thoroughly exploring the concept of equity within a broad spectrum, beyond the provision of a specific needs response. That is, striving toward equitable outcomes for vulnerable population groups is more than just providing the 'quick-win' responses such as meeting infrastructure needs. For example, people with disability or older people may require their physical needs to be addressed to access services such as housing. However, these clients may also require support in other important aspects of their lives given the prevalence and experiences of people with disability experiencing domestic and family violence. This is in light of the importance to build the evidence-base to ensure future actions are responsive to the needs and experiences of people with disability.

For people with disability

There is an absence of data on the prevalence of domestic and family violence experienced by people with disability. Evidence of trends in violence more generally show that violence perpetrated against women and girls with disabilities is significantly more diverse in nature and more severe than for women in general. Compared to their peers, women with disabilities experience significantly higher levels of all forms of violence more intensely and frequently, are subjected to such violence by a greater number of perpetrators, and have considerably fewer pathways to safety. Violence has unique causes, takes on unique forms and results in unique consequences for people with disability; examples include controlling access to medication, mobility and communication supports, abuse of Powers of Attorney, and threats to withdraw care or institutionalise.

Given the absence of data, the focus under the Second Action Plan has been on understanding the prevalence and experiences of people with disability experiencing domestic and family violence. This is in light of the importance to build the evidence-base to ensure future actions are responsive to the needs and experiences of people with disability.

However, the progress to date has fallen short of advancing equity priorities for this population group. This was raised during consultations and reflected in the Service Provider Survey, where the fewest people agreed progress for people with disability had been made compared to all vulnerable population groups. In particular, more needs to be done to make people with disability feel safe.

Of note, stakeholders spoke about the importance of considering and thoroughly exploring the concept of equity within a broad spectrum, beyond the provision of a specific needs response. That is, striving toward equitable outcomes for vulnerable population groups is more than just providing the 'quick-win' responses such as meeting infrastructure needs. For example, people with disability or older people may require their physical needs to be addressed to access services such as housing. However, these clients may also require support in other important aspects of their lives given the prevalence and experiences of people with disability experiencing domestic and family violence. This is in light of the importance to build the evidence-base to ensure future actions are responsive to the needs and experiences of people with disability.

---


power imbalance within the relationship between them and their carers or their family members, who can be perpetrators of violence.\textsuperscript{123,124}

One commonly cited barrier to progress among stakeholders was the siloed nature of the service system. That is, there are services to work with people with disability, and those to work with people experiencing domestic and family violence. However the former may not have the expertise in domestic and family violence, while domestic and family violence services may have limited experience identifying and working with people with disability.

This is exacerbated by the current reform environment, with disability services shifting to the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) and thus falling under Commonwealth jurisdiction. The NDIS shifts choice in care provision from the government to the person with disability, who can allocate their funding package to their carer of choice. While this can increase choice, it may also expose people with disability to greater risk of being taken advantage of by carers, particularly where this may not be a carer from an accredited provider.

The Service Provider Survey suggests most respondents do not believe sufficient progress has been made for people with disability under the Second Action Plan. This includes access to, and uptake of, services, being able to have their needs met, and particularly for the safety of this population group (see Chart 12.8).


Review of the Second Action Plan

Chart 12.8 Service providers reported level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland domestic and family violence reforms have met the needs of people with disability, 2019

Q3: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in access to services for the following population groups. (n = 22)

Q4: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to an increase in uptake of services by following population groups. (n = 20)

Q5: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the following population groups are better able to have their needs met because of the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms. (n = 22)

Q6: Please rate the extent to which you agree that the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence reforms have contributed to improved safety for the following population groups. (n = 20)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis of Service Provider Survey, 2019

One potential mechanism for ensuring services are meeting the needs of vulnerable population groups is to embed specialist expertise to support capability building. Stakeholders from implementing agencies shared a view that there is potential to embed expertise in workforce capability building, so that the needs and rights of these clients are better considered and met by providers and their staff from general domestic and family violence services.

An example of embedded specialist expertise supporting existing services and the needs and rights of vulnerable populations is within the DEAT. This is a joint initiative between the DCDSS and QPS Gold Coast Police District, with an embedded officer from DCDSS within the QPS, providing constant and timely support for the QPS Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce (Gold Coast Taskforce). The purpose of the trial is to:

- Identify referral and reporting pathways for people with disabilities and older people impacted by, or at risk of, abuse
- Identify and facilitate warm referrals for victim survivors to an appropriate agency for care and or follow up
- Identify opportunities to increase the disability sector awareness, knowledge and capability development
- Gather information and knowledge of this cohort to enable development of improved long-term responses.125

---

125 QPS. (no date). Evaluation Framework - Disability and Elder Abuse Trial.
The DEAT model not only considers the important service and support needs of victim survivors, but also addresses the complexity of cases where the perpetrator may have a disability.

Stakeholders shared common confidence that the Third Action Plan would be better positioned to achieve equitable outcomes for people with disability by setting a stronger focus and leveraging the available evidence base. Similar to actions aimed at older people, stakeholders highlighted the needs for cross-sector and interagency collaboration to ensure successful implementation of actions for people living with disability. This includes partnerships between disability services providers, frontline police and frontline health staff to leverage integrated service responses that consider the unique characteristics of people with disability. Stakeholders believed that future actions would also need to account for the context of the NDIS roll-out in Queensland. It is likely that there will be a handover of some responsibility between the current lead agency of the actions for people living with disability – DCDSS – and the National Disability Insurance Agency in Queensland.

Steps are already being made in addressing the gaps for people with disability. In 2019, the Queensland Government released a plan to respond to domestic and family violence against people with disability. This plan contains four focus areas: raising awareness, building sector capability and capacity, implementing practical responses and building the evidence, each of which are closely linked to specific foundational elements and supporting outcomes of the evaluation framework. The plan is acknowledged by the Queensland Government as an opportunity to build on the existing work by the Strategy and drive actions to end domestic and family violence for everyone in Queensland.126

---

For people who identify as LGBTIQ:
Stakeholders noted little progress to date in improving the capacity of the domestic and family violence sector to effectively work with, and respond to the needs of, people identifying as LGBTIQ, because of limited evidence on progress made to date and reported insufficient capability. This is highlighted in the Service Provider Survey, in which respondents consistently did not agree progress had been made for people who identify as LGBTIQ (Chart 12.9).

Chart 12.9 Service providers reported level of agreement with statements on whether and how the Queensland domestic and family violence reforms have met the needs of people who identify as LGBTIQ, 2019

While the results in Chart 12.9 particularly relate to service system responses, some progress has been made in terms of increasing knowledge of domestic and family violence among people who identify as LGBTIQ. For example, DCSYW has collaborated with the AIDS Council to assist and upskill their workers, while the DoE has worked with True Relationships to identify specific needs of people who identify as LGBTIQ in RRE. Stakeholders agreed that a stronger concentration of work in the Third Action Plan is required through capacity building to address needs for people who identify as LGBTIQ. The LGBTIQ communications campaign was launched in late 2018, with its key messages ‘domestic and family violence is unacceptable’, ‘domestic violence is not just physical – it comes in many forms’, and ‘help is available – here’s how’. It is too early to determine the effectiveness of the campaign.
13 Efficiency

13.1 Have the initiatives and activities been economical, efficient, and effective to optimise success and deliver value for money to Queensland (efficiency)?

Progress to date

Given the size of the investment in the domestic and family violence reforms, it is important to understand whether this has been used efficiently by implementing agencies.

Initiatives have been undertaken to enhance accountability and understand the efficiency of implementing the recommendations of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report (as opposed to specifically the Second Action Plan). In particular, a Funding and Investment Model (the Model) has been developed to demonstrate the investment mix of domestic and family violence responses. The purpose of the Model is to review investment commissioning at a point in time based on the seven investment principles outlined in the Model. Stakeholders reiterated that one of the intentions of the Model is to help showcase the current allocation of funding against the domestic and family violence reforms to determine whether needs are met and gaps in services are addressed in the most efficient manner, including by understanding the direction of investment, either in crisis responses or in prevention and early intervention. Queensland Treasury have also played a role in monitoring progress of the domestic and family violence reforms toward achieving long-term outcomes.

Allocation of resources to date

As of 30 June 2018, the Funding and Investment Model identifies that $351.61 million was spent in Queensland between 2015–16 and 2017–18 on domestic and family violence specialist services. This is more than the $328.9 million over six years from 2015-16 to implement recommendations from the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report. In other words, the reporting summary from this Model is not strictly bounded by the responses to the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ recommendations, but delivers an overall investment assessment of all funding for domestic and family violence reform combined.

Reinforcing findings in supporting outcome five, investment to date has been on crisis support. Fifty-seven per cent of the investment has been allocated to the crisis responses, including homelessness programs, crisis accommodation, domestic and family violence counselling and high risk teams. This is in comparison to investment in recovery ($88.2 million or 24%), early intervention ($53.86 million or 14%) and prevention ($20.26 million or 5%). In particular, there has been a focus on investing in specialist support services and crisis accommodation. Funding for these services largely outnumbered the investment amounts for other services such as perpetrator programs, child protection, integrated responses/ high risks, specialist courts, legal advice, information and representation, as well as capacity building.

Efficiency

Overall, within the limited evidence available, stakeholders report there are indications that the Queensland Government has demonstrated efficiency in implementing the Second Action Plan. Responses to the Implementing Agency Survey (2019), reported high levels of agreement that the actions have been delivered as intended and within budget. Seventy-five per cent of all survey participants responded to these statements with a score of eight to ten level of agreement. This indicates that the implementation has been perceived as being economical and effective by Queensland Government staff.
Table 13.1 During consultations, implementing agencies noted that actions had generally been delivered on time and on budget. This has not yet been validated through other data sources. There were instances where implementing agencies reported it had taken longer to implement some actions than anticipated due to their complexity. In these instances, timeframes were renegotiated. Importantly, it was commented that extending the timeframes when faced with complexity often resulted in better and more enduring outcomes. For example, it provided more time for engagement with stakeholders and co-design.

Future direction

Several opportunities were identified by stakeholders to ensure ongoing efficiency of the domestic and family violence reform. First, stakeholders reflected that no one measurement tool should be expected to depict a holistic view on the economic efficiency of the reform. Translation of measures that reflect the value for money of investment requires collating the evidence from various sources over time to complement each other and allow for a system-level understanding of the cost-effectiveness of the reform activities. Further investigation is warranted in the next phases of the Strategy to determine how the different frameworks and model can be best refined and structured to collaboratively support the evidence base around the value for money and economic assessment of the reform.

Stakeholders also noted that there may be opportunities to refine the investment approach. First, shifting toward a more outcomes-oriented system to support collaboration between agencies and providers. Second, by moving beyond pilots and focusing investment in areas known to work.
13.2 To what extent do policy makers and program providers feel empowered to design and implement programs that are evaluation ready?

The extent to which implementing agencies feel empowered to design and implement programs and actions

Providing agencies with a sense of autonomy and freedom to design and implement programs and actions is essential to ensure that actions are well moulded to environmental challenges by those that are most in-tune with those challenges.

Results from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) shows that implementing agency staff generally feel that they are able to influence the design of actions and the approach taken to implementing those actions (Chart 13.2 Q1:f\textsuperscript{127} and Q1:g\textsuperscript{128}). Overall, 75% of survey respondents agreed (a score of six or above) with the notion that they feel that they are able to influence the design and implementation of actions. However, there is a degree of variance in the survey results that appears to be driven by job positions. More specifically, all scores below five in response to Q1:f, and all scores below seven for Q1:g are from non-executive staff members. This suggests that executive staff members have a higher degree of confidence in their autonomy associated with designing and implementing actions, as might be expected.

There does not appear to be any consensus by agency staff as to the desire for greater autonomy in influencing the design or implementation of the actions for which they are responsible. This level of autonomy is used as a proxy to assess the self-reported feeling of empowerment from agencies – a measure of efficiency as outlined in the evaluation framework. Overall, agency staff are indifferent to greater autonomy, with a median score of six for Q1:h\textsuperscript{129} and Q1:i\textsuperscript{130} (Chart 13.2). The variation in scores appears to be independent of the job title of the survey participant, or if they identify as a member of a project team. However, as expected, there is a slightly negative correlation between the score that respondents give to the degree they feel they are able to influence the approach taken to implementation and the desire to have greater autonomy in implementing actions (-0.19). This correlation increases to -0.425 when only considering survey respondents within a project team. The correlation between current autonomy for designing actions and the desire for greater autonomy to design actions is negligible.

\textsuperscript{127} Statement Q1:f) I feel able to influence the design of those action(s) under the Queensland domestic and family violence Prevention Strategy for which my agency is responsible.

\textsuperscript{128} Statement Q1:g) I feel able to influence the approach taken to implementing those action(s) under the Queensland domestic and family violence Prevention Strategy for which my agency is responsible.

\textsuperscript{129} Statement Q1:h) I would like more influence over the design of those action(s) under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy for which my agency is responsible.

\textsuperscript{130} Statement Q1:i) I would like more influence over the approach taken to implementing those action(s) under the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy for which my agency is responsible.
The extent to which actions and agencies are evaluation ready

In terms of implementing programs that are evaluation-ready, stakeholders commented that there is a desire to implement the learnings from the evaluations and scale learnings. This suggests a level of enthusiasm to move beyond pilots and ensure learnings are scaled.

A capability building program has also been developed as part of the evaluation framework for the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2016–26) to assist staff within implementation agencies to develop their evaluation skills and implement evaluation-ready programs. Under the capability building program, progress has been made in terms of delivering capability building activities. This includes:

- Training needs survey (undertaken by ISSR) – to identify the capability building preferences and needs of agency personnel
- Face-to-face training – four three-hour workshops focused on the topics of the evaluation framework, developing evaluation questions, developing program logics and types of evaluation
- Online toolkit – comprising online learning material including six modules
- Workshop – to support development of a community of practice.

Other forms of support to build capability include embedding an evaluation expert or providing ad hoc advice for specific evaluation activities associated with domestic and family violence.
Engagement with the online resources covering 13 September 2018 to 2 November 2018 is shown in Table 13.2. Uptake of the online resources has been low, or lower than was anticipated, given the size of the implementing community (i.e. executive groups and project teams across 14 agencies). The most frequently visited pages of the online toolkit, ‘principles of evaluation’ and ‘program logic’ were also topics covered in the face-to-face workshop, suggesting that stakeholders are more likely to interact with content that is delivered in other formats. The average time spent on the individual pages of the online toolkit also suggests that the average user does not spend a sufficient amount of time on each page to interact with most of the available content. The number of unique page views relative to all pages views implies that only small numbers of users revisit the content once viewed.

Table 13.2 Website and sub-site use: Sep 13, 2018 - Nov 2, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page views</th>
<th>Unique page views</th>
<th>Avg. time on page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front/home</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1m 48s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of evaluation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3m 3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program logic</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1m 28s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation framework</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1m 27s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring success</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding findings</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1m 39s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the evidence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2m 15s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>594</strong></td>
<td><strong>368</strong></td>
<td><strong>1m 47s</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Web analytics provided by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, 2018

The training needs survey had 27 responses. While small, it nonetheless provides some findings about evaluation readiness. According to Chart 13.3, just over 30% of participants reported that they procure evaluation related services to help with evaluation activity, and fewer still are involved in designing evaluation for the domestic and family violence reform initiatives. The survey also found that confidence in using the evaluation framework was mixed. This suggests there is scope for the capability building activities to continue to empower implementing agency staff to be evaluation-ready.
The Implementing Agency Survey (2019) provides more insight into the awareness and knowledge of agency staff of available evaluation resources related to the Strategy (Chart 13.4). Overall, the survey results show that the majority of survey respondents are aware of the evaluation framework and understand its elements (Q4:b\textsuperscript{131} and Q4:d\textsuperscript{132}).

There are also opportunities to improve the awareness and use of the evaluation toolkit (Q4:f\textsuperscript{133}), with approximately 25% of survey respondents disagreeing with the statement that they ‘are aware and use the evaluation toolkit of resources’.

Results differ between staff within project teams and non-project teams. Overall, project team members scored higher than non-project team members for Q4:b, Q4:d and Q4:e (Chart 13.4). However, there is still the same apparent variation in scores of project team members for the awareness and use of the evaluation toolkit, with approximately 25% of project team members suggesting that they lacked sufficient awareness, or rarely used the evaluation toolkit of resources (a score of five or below). There is an opportunity to improve the awareness and use of both the evaluation framework and toolkit in the Third Action Plan. The capability program, as implemented in the Third Action Plan based on experience of implementing agencies to date, will seek to enhance understanding and uptake of these evaluation tools, in various measures (e.g. educational webinar, ad hoc advice, etc.) as suited with the diverse needs of different implementing agencies.

\textsuperscript{131} Statement Q4:b) I am aware of the evaluation framework for the Strategy.

\textsuperscript{132} Statement Q4:d) I understand the elements of the evaluation framework for the Strategy.

\textsuperscript{133} Statement Q4:f) I am aware of and use the evaluation toolkit of resources.
Results from the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) indicate that there is a high level of sense of evaluation capability and readiness within agencies. Approximately 75% of survey respondents agreed that their agency is committed to evaluating actions, has established clear process mechanisms for evaluating those actions, and has the skills and ability to evaluate actions (Chart 13.5 Q4:a\textsuperscript{134}, Q4:c\textsuperscript{135} and Q4:g\textsuperscript{136}). However, there is also a strong desire to be involved in evaluation capability building activities (Q4:e\textsuperscript{137}), with most survey participants responding favourably to this statement.

There appears to be some relationship between evaluation readiness and an awareness and use of the evaluation toolkit. A Spearman’s rank correlation test confirms there is some positive correlation between participant scores for the use and awareness of evaluation toolkit resources and the perception that an agency has an established clear process for evaluated actions (Q4:f and Q4:c) (0.59, n=48) as well as with the desire to be involved with capability building activities (Q4:f and Q4:e) (0.54, n=49). This suggests that engagement with the evaluation toolkit is strong with those that already have a strong awareness of evaluation activities and their importance. This suggests that improving evaluation toolkit uptake might need to first begin with educating staff of evaluation activities and their importance.

\textsuperscript{134} Statement Q4:a) My agency is committed to evaluating those actions for which it is responsible to help inform future decision making.

\textsuperscript{135} Statement Q4:c) In general, my agency has established clear processes and mechanisms for evaluating those actions for which it is responsible.

\textsuperscript{136} Statement Q4:g) I have the skills required to evaluate specific actions for which I am responsible for implementing.

\textsuperscript{137} Statement Q4:e) I have a desire to be involved in the evaluation capability building activities.
Chart 13.5 Implementing agency staff reported level of evaluation readiness related to the Second Action Plan, 2019

Q4 :a) My agency is committed to evaluating those action(s) for which it is responsible to help inform future decision making (n=54)
Q4 :c) In general, my agency has established clear processes and mechanisms for evaluating those action(s) for which it is responsible (n=50)
Q4 :e) I have a desire to be involved in the evaluation capability building activities (n=53)
Q4 :g) I have the skills required to evaluate specific actions which I am responsible for implementing (n=54)

Source: Deloitte Access Economics analysis using implementing agency survey, 2019
14 Conclusion and next steps

14.1 Summary of progress
This report has provided evidence of Queensland Government’s commendable progress to date in progressing implementation of the 84 actions contained within the Second Action Plan, and the commitment and motivation across sectors and agencies that has contributed to this progress.

In terms of how these actions relate to the broader outcomes being sought from the Strategy, it is largely too early to make definitive statements. This likely reflects the ambitious nature of the Strategy to not just change knowledge, but attitudes and behaviour of Queenslanders, and that this in itself takes time. Reflecting that the Strategy extends over 2016–2026, and this review covers from 2016-17 to 2018-19, it is expected that some outcomes are yet to be realised and will likely materialise over the longer-term. For this reason, ongoing data collection and reporting will be crucial.

That said, consultations and flagship evaluations of key initiatives have provided some initial positive signs of progress. This includes, but is not limited to:

- High levels of knowledge of what constitutes domestic and family violence, and examples where organisations (government and non-government), are increasing awareness domestic and family violence.
- Increases in uptake of WRA among workplaces and reported increases in employee knowledge of government domestic and family violence policies.
- Increases in the justice system holding perpetrators to account (e.g. increases in intervention orders) and being perceived in holding perpetrators to account (e.g. findings of the of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court evaluation from interviews with victim survivors and those working at the court).
- Activities aimed at increasing awareness of domestic and family violence, through the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy.
- Examples of place-based approaches, designed by and tailored to, local community need. This also includes examples of organisations working together to drive progress in their community. This approach enables communities to develop a response that is customised to their local context and need, ensuring the response is more tailored and targeted to areas of local need.

Importantly, this report provides some evidence as to features that may be driving this progress, including:

- Leadership – both at a senior executive level and more locally, to initiate, create stakeholder buy-in and drive change within the community or organisation in which they work.
- Collaboration – between implementing agencies and services, whether it be through informal or more formal connections.
- Embedded officers – as a mechanism for sharing officer knowledge, building capacity (for example DEAT) and facilitating collaboration between organisations or agencies.
- Co-design and user engagement – whether the user is the community who are designing their response, victim survivors or service providers. The DJAG and communications case studies highlight examples of involving users to iterate and refine interventions.

Despite this, there are some areas where further progress is required, specifically:

- Vulnerable population groups, including for people from CALD backgrounds, people with disability, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, older people, people in regional and remote areas and people who identify as LGBTIQ.
- Focusing on ensuring victim survivors feel safe and are safe. It is too early to understand how this is occurring across the system, though the Service Provider Survey suggests more could be done.
- More information is required to understand perpetrator interventions. While there is evidence progress has been made for the justice system holding perpetrators to account, there are also
indications victim survivors and service providers are not necessarily seeing changes in perpetrator behaviour and taking responsibility for their behaviour to improve victim survivor safety. This will be further validated following completion of the perpetrator case study.

- Filling gaps in knowledge, including certain behaviours (financial control, harassment over electronic communications, and psychological and verbal abuse) that comprise domestic and family violence, and challenging attitudes regarding gender equality, which drives domestic and family violence.

- Promoting a strategic and outcomes-focused governance to drive momentum of the reforms, to reflect a shift from a more compliance-focused approach to implementing recommendations and actions.

Importantly, as the Strategy progresses, it will be important to embed the ‘what works’ into the approach, and continue to ensure data collection remains a strong feature to support monitoring and continuous learning.
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Appendix A : Additional analysis on supporting outcome one

A.1 Definitions of six types of domestic and family violence
The definitions of the six behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence and form a significant part of the analysis of section 4.1 are displayed in table A.1. These types of domestic and family violence and their definitions are based on the QSS questions 6-17.

Table A.1 Question 6-17 of the QSS and its associated domestic and family violence category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSS question</th>
<th>Survey response options</th>
<th>Domestic and family violence category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q6) If one partner in a domestic relationship slaps or pushes the other partner to cause harm or fear, is this a form of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, usually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q7) And how serious is this?</td>
<td>Very serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quite serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not that serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not serious at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q8) If one partner in a domestic relationship forces the other partner to have sex, is this a form of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, usually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q9) And how serious is this?</td>
<td>Very serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quite serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not that serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not serious at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q10) If one partner in a domestic relationship tries to scare or control the other partner by threatening to hurt other family members, is this a form of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td>Threats and intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, usually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q11) And how serious is this?</td>
<td>Very serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS question</td>
<td>Survey response options</td>
<td>Domestic and family violence category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q12) If one partner in a domestic relationship repeatedly criticises the other partner to make them feel bad or useless, is this a form of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Yes, always, Yes, usually, Yes, sometimes, Don’t know, No, Refused</td>
<td>Verbal and psychological abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q13) And how serious is this?</td>
<td>Very serious, Quite serious, Not that serious, Not serious at all, Don’t know, Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q14) Excluding a situation involving addictions such as gambling, alcohol, drugs, etc., if one partner in a domestic relationship tries to control the other partner by denying them access to money, is this a form of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Yes, always, Yes, usually, Yes, sometimes, Don’t know, No, Refused</td>
<td>Financial control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q15) And how serious is this?</td>
<td>Very serious, Quite serious, Not that serious, Not serious at all, Don’t know, Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q16) If one partner in a domestic relationship harasses the other partner via repeated phone or electronic means such as email, text messages or social media, is this a form of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Yes, always, Yes, usually, Yes, sometimes, Don’t know, No, Refused</td>
<td>Harassment over electronic communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q17) And how serious is this?</td>
<td>Very serious, Quite serious, Not that serious, Not serious at all, Don’t know, Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.2 Analysis of the knowledge of domestic and family violence of vulnerable population groups

This section displays the level of knowledge of what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence of the following vulnerable populations: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people with disability, people from CALD backgrounds and people who identify as LGBTIQ. Generally, the majority of people identified as belonging to vulnerable populations in Queensland recognise those behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence. Lesser proportions (albeit still a majority) consider these behaviours to be serious. The difference between those able to identify behaviours associated with domestic and family violence, and those who considered these behaviours to be serious was particularly pronounced for Queenslanders who identify as LGBTIQ and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. There may be an opportunity for further work to improve knowledge and understanding of the seriousness of domestic and family violence behaviours among vulnerable populations.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

Domestic and family violence disproportionately impacts Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. For example, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women are 35 times more likely than non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women to be hospitalised from domestic and family violence abuse. Changing the knowledge and attitudes of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with regards to domestic and family violence is therefore an element of reducing the prevalence of domestic and family violence throughout Queensland.

Changing knowledge of domestic and family violence

Overall, up to 97% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders understand and consider all six behaviours to constitute domestic and family violence in 2018. Approximately 92% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders also believe that all six behaviours are serious issues.

Chart A.1 displays changes of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population’s attitudes and knowledge towards domestic and family violence between 2017 and 2018. There have been some indications of improvements in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ understanding over the last 12 months. There are indications of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people improving their knowledge and understanding of financial control, harassment, and physical abuse constituting domestic and family violence. However, none of these changes are considered statistically significant.

As displayed in Chart 5.8 in section 4.1, 84% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders agree to the statement that ‘it is important that our culture respects gender equality and doesn’t encourage traditional norms and stereotypes’.

These results show an improvement in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ knowledge and attitudes towards domestic and family violence. It is important to note, however, that these changes are not statistically significant, and therefore it is appropriate to continue to monitor attitudes over time. The estimates for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have large confidence intervals, therefore, interpretation of results and movements should be treated with caution. It is encouraging to see an improvement over time in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ knowledge towards domestic and family violence, as a similar indication of improvements over time was not observed across the Queensland population as a whole.

People with disability

People with disabilities are at greater risk of experiencing domestic and family violence for many reasons, including carers abusing their power, lack of service supports and systems appropriate for people with disability, and a lack of social awareness of the issue of domestic and family violence in the disabled community.

Changing knowledge of domestic and family violence

Up to 92% of Queenslanders with disability understand and consider all six behaviours to constitute domestic and family violence in 2018. Up to 90% of Queenslanders with disability understand that all six behaviours are serious issues. These results are consistent with the Queensland population as a whole.

Chart A.2 displays the changes in attitudes and knowledge of people with disability towards domestic and family violence between 2017 and 2018. There has been minimal change in people with disability’s understanding and knowledge of behaviours constituting domestic and family violence. The largest indication of change has been an increase in understanding towards verbal and psychological abuse, while understanding and knowledge towards financial control has shown indications of declines (Chart A.2). However, it is important to note that none of these changes are statistically significant.

139 ‘yes’ responses in this analysis include responses of: ‘yes, sometimes’, ‘yes, usually’, and ‘yes, always’. ‘serious’ responses in this analysis include: ‘very serious’ and ‘quite serious’

140 This data does not show that all those who responded ‘yes’ in the survey believe that the behaviour is ‘serious’, or that those who responded ‘serious’ believe that the behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence.

Cultural and linguistically diverse (CALD) populations

People from CALD backgrounds have particular vulnerabilities that may compound their experience of domestic and family violence. This can be due to issues such as visa uncertainty, fear of deportation, lack of social support, and inability to access available domestic and family violence service supports and systems due to language barriers. Domestic and family violence may also be considered a less serious issue in some cultural groups due to differences in cultural views on the male role in a relationship, and broader society.

Changing knowledge of domestic and family violence

People from CALD backgrounds are defined in this analysis as those that speak a language other than English in their home.

Overall, up to 93% of people from CALD backgrounds understand and consider all six behaviours to constitute domestic and family violence in 2018. Up to 89% of people from CALD backgrounds understand that all six behaviours are serious issues. These results are slightly lower than for the Queensland population as a whole. However, these differences are not statistically significant.

---

142 ‘yes’ responses in this analysis include responses of: ‘yes, sometimes’, ‘yes, usually’, and ‘yes, always’. ‘serious’ responses in this analysis include: ‘very serious’ and ‘quite serious’

143 This data does not show that all those who responded ‘yes’ in the survey believe that the behaviour is ‘serious’, or that those who responded ‘serious’ believe that the behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence.

Chart A.3 displays changes of attitudes and knowledge of people from CALD backgrounds towards domestic and family violence between 2017 and 2018. There has been an increase in understanding and knowledge of financial control constituting domestic and family violence, and indications of an increase in the understanding of the serious nature of the behaviour of financial control and physical abuse (Chart A.3). However for all the other behaviours, with the exception of harassment, there are indications of a decrease in the understanding and knowledge that the behaviours constitute domestic and family violence, but an increase in the understanding of the serious nature of the behaviours (Chart A.3). However, it is important to note that none of these changes are statistically significant.

Chart A.3 Changes in responses of ‘serious’ and ‘yes’ to QSS questions 6-17 in Table A.1 among people from CALD backgrounds, 2017–2018

Source: Queensland Social Survey 2017 and 2018 data

**People who identify as LGBTIQ**

Domestic and family violence among people who identify as LGBTIQ is estimated to occur at a similar rate to the broader community. However, the issue is considered to be hidden from the broader Queensland community, and less well understood among LGBTIQ communities themselves.

Changing awareness and attitudes towards Domestic and family violence

Overall, up to 97% of people who identify as LGBTIQ understand and consider all six behaviours to constitute domestic and family violence in 2018. Up to 86% of people who identify as LGBTIQ understand that all six behaviours are serious issues.

Chart A.4 displays changes of attitudes and knowledge of the Queensland LGBTIQ population towards domestic and family violence between 2017 and 2018. There has largely been no change in the understanding or awareness of domestic and family violence among people who identify as LGBTIQ.

---

145 ‘yes’ responses in this analysis include responses of: ‘yes, sometimes’, ‘yes, usually’, and ‘yes, always’. ‘serious’ responses in this analysis include: ‘very serious’ and ‘quite serious’

146 This data does not show that all those who responded ‘yes’ in the survey believe that the behaviour is ‘serious’, or that those who responded ‘serious’ believe that the behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence.

LGBTIQ over the past 12 months. However, there has been an improvement in awareness of financial control since 2017. However, it is important to note that none of these changes are statistically significant.

Chart A.4 People who identify as LGBTIQ changes in responses of ‘serious’ and ‘yes’ to QSS questions 6-17; 2017-2018

Source: Queensland Social Survey 2017 and 2018 data

148 ‘yes’ responses in this analysis include responses of: ‘yes, sometimes’, ‘yes, usually’, and ‘yes, always’. ‘serious’ responses in this analysis include: ‘very serious’ and ‘quite serious’

149 This data does not show that all those who responded ‘yes’ in the survey believe that the behaviour is ‘serious’, or that those who responded ‘serious’ believe that the behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence.
Appendix B : List of intermediate outcomes and how they map to supporting outcomes

**SUPPORTING OUTCOME 1 - QUEENSLANDERS TAKE A ZERO TOLERANCE APPROACH TO DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions (for intermediate outcomes)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent have Queenslanders shown an improved understanding that all types of domestic and family violence are unacceptable?</td>
<td>• National Community Attitudes Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How effective has the Strategy been in informing victims and perpetrators about where to go for help?</td>
<td>• New Attitudes and Perceptions Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How effective has the Strategy been in facilitating bystanders to take appropriate and safe action to prevent domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>• Annual Scorecard data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent do Queenslanders demonstrate an understanding of the reason and need for cultural change when it comes to tackling domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>• Independent research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the Queensland community worked together to prevent domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>• Flagship evaluation data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORTING OUTCOME 2 - RESPECTFUL RELATIONSHIPS AND NON-VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR ARE EMBEDDED IN OUR COMMUNITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions (for intermediate outcomes)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the school community shown an improved understanding of the importance of respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour?</td>
<td>• National Community Attitudes Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has there been an increase in the capacity of schools to implement respectful relationships education?</td>
<td>• New Attitudes and Perceptions Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual Scorecard data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indicators of respectful relationships implementation within schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flagship evaluation data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of the Second Action Plan

**IS THERE AN INCREASED AWARENESS WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY OF THE VALUE OF RESPECTFUL RELATIONSHIPS EDUCATION?**
- To what extent do students have improved understanding of and skills in respectful relationships?
- To what extent has the broader community supported programs aimed at increasing gender equality, respectful relationships and non-violence across community, workplaces and education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING OUTCOME 3 – QUEENSLAND COMMUNITY, BUSINESS, RELIGIOUS, SPORTING AND GOVERNMENT LEADERS ARE TAKING ACTION AND WORKING TOGETHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Evaluation Questions (for Intermediate outcomes)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the Queensland community been working together to protect and support victims and model respectful relationships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective have the networks between and across communities and organisations been in enabling the sharing of supports, resources and ideas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the Strategy helped promote cultural change in the broader Queensland community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth stakeholder interviews (Providers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORTING OUTCOME 4 – QUEENSLAND’S WORKPLACES AND WORKFORCES CHALLENGE ATTITUDES CONTRIBUTING TO VIOLENCE AND EFFECTIVELY SUPPORT WORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Specific Evaluation Questions (for Intermediate outcomes)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data Sources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How have workplaces promoted the prevention of domestic and family violence and influenced cultural change?</td>
<td>Work by external accreditation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective have workplaces been in raising awareness of domestic and family violence support?</td>
<td>Annual Scorecard data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have workplaces built capability to recognise signs of domestic and family violence, and respond and refer appropriately, to better support affected employees?</td>
<td>Public sector employee opinion survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Attitudes and Perception Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flagship evaluation data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUPPORTING OUTCOME 5 – VICTIMS AND THEIR FAMILIES ARE SAFE AND SUPPORTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions (for intermediate outcomes)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Has the Strategy helped build culturally appropriate service responses that meet the needs of victims?</td>
<td>• Annual Scorecard data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How effective have integrated services been in supporting victims’ needs?</td>
<td>• New Queensland DFV Victim Survey (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the Strategy facilitated improved access to appropriate and responsive services to victims of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>• Queensland Homelessness Information Platform ad hoc data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the access to, and responsiveness of, services helped victims to rebuild their lives, gain independence, and avoid re-victimisation?</td>
<td>• Specialist Homelessness Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In-depth Stakeholder Interviews (Users)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flagship evaluation data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPORTING OUTCOME 6 – PERPETRATORS STOP USING VIOLENCE AND ARE HELD TO ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions (for intermediate outcomes)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Has the Strategy helped build a more seamless and integrated service response that meets the needs of perpetrators?</td>
<td>• In-depth Stakeholder Interviews (Users)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent have services to perpetrators been accessible?</td>
<td>• Annual Scorecard data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent have perpetrators shown an improved understanding that their violence is a problem?</td>
<td>• New Queensland Perpetrator Survey (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How effective have integrated services been in enabling perpetrators to overcome their domestic violence?</td>
<td>• Flagship evaluation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the capacity in individuals working in perpetrator interventions been developed to respond to the dynamics and impacts of domestic and family violence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUPPORTING OUTCOME 7 — THE JUSTICE SYSTEM DEALS EFFECTIVELY WITH DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions (for intermediate outcomes)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How effective has the justice system process been in providing coordinated, consistent and timely responses to domestic and family violence matters?</td>
<td>• Annual Scorecard data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the justice system been supported to provide comprehensive and integrated services that meet the needs of perpetrators, victims and their families?</td>
<td>• Queensland DFV Victim Survey (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent have victims been kept safe leading up to, during and after court?</td>
<td>• Queensland Wide Inter-linked Courts records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How effective has the justice system process been in implementing actions to hold perpetrators accountable for their actions?</td>
<td>• Flagship evaluation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent have Indigenous perpetrators, victims and their families shown an increased understanding of and confidence in the process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How have Community Justice Groups in 16 discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities demonstrated an increased capability to support and respond to domestic and family violence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How effective has the Strategy been in supporting local justice authority structures to respond to domestic and family violence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISSR Evaluation Framework
Appendix C: Stakeholders consulted

This table outlines the stakeholders consulted as part of the semi-structured interviews. It excludes consultations for case studies, which are outlined in the case studies themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder consulted</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Department of the Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>• Rebecca McGarrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alexandra Gasteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women</td>
<td>• Michael Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kylie Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Department of Health</td>
<td>• Karen Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rachel Vowels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Department of Justice and Attorney-General</td>
<td>• David Mackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nicola Doumany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peter Brandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>• Denise Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>• Joanne Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Department of Education</td>
<td>• Hayley Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Queensland Police Service</td>
<td>• Ian Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regan Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stephan Gollschewski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brett Schafferius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 DFVI Council</td>
<td>• Kay McGrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Karni Liddell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lance Hockridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kathryn McMillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annabel Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ian Leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kathleen Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Karyn Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Aboriginal And Torres Strait Islander Advisory Group</td>
<td>• Charles Passi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consulted</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 Death Review and Advisory Board Member and Secretariat | • Kathleen Baird  
• Susan Beattie  
• Travis Heller |
| 11 Department of Housing and Public Works | • Liza Carroll  
• Trish Wooley |
| 12 Queensland Corrective Services | • Deputy Commissioner Paul Stewart |
| 13 Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors | • Helen Ferguson |
| 14 Focus group with QT, DPC and CSYW | • Allison Mew  
• Kristina Jones  
• Alexandra Gasteen  
• Kylie Stephen |
| 15 DATSIP Senior Project Officers | • Two focus groups |
| 16 DCSYW Regional Child and Family Connect Committees | • Three focus groups |
## Appendix D: Document register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document name</th>
<th>Date received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background of the Queensland Government’s Domestic and Family Violence Strategy 2016-2026</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and family violence legislative amendments since 2015</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key milestones dates of the Domestic and Family Violence Strategy from 2015 to 2019</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance framework of the Domestic and Family Violence Strategy</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Context for the Domestic and Family Violence Strategy</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Evaluation Capability Program - Evaluation Workshop Jun 5-7, 2018 - Appendices 5.1 to 5.6</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC evaluation training handbook</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Logic Template A3 in Word and PNG (Narrative form)</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training survey report: domestic and family violence Evaluation Capability Training June 5-7, 2018</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening data quality Capability Network Workshop: PPT slides</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Group update on the 2018 domestic and family violence evaluation capability program</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Council update on the evaluation framework for The Queensland Government’s Domestic and Family Violence Strategy 2016-2026</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSR Capability Building Report</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC Case Study shortlist and selection criteria</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights report card: Year 3</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights Card data collection process 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Government’s Domestic and Family Violence Strategy 2016-2026</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicator matrix, September 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council annual report December 2015 to November 2016</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council annual report December 2016 to November 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council six month report December 2015 to May 2016</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Social Survey 2018 - Domestic and Family Violence Survey Report:</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council - Queensland Community Research - Research Report</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship evaluations under the evaluation framework for the Domestic and</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2016-2026)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response implementation update as at 31 August 2016</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response implementation update as at 30 November 2016</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response implementation update as at 28 February 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response implementation update as at 31 August 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response implementation update as at 28 February 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response implementation update as at 31 August 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Social Survey 2018 - Domestic and Family Violence Survey Report</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website analytics for Queensland Government Capability Building Intranet, 13</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018 to 2 November 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Report: Enabling Action 13 DCSYW</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Report: Recommendation 91</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Closure Report: Recommendations 24-27</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan: The Queensland Government’s Domestic and Family Violence</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2016-2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Report: Recommendation 58</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation progress overview: DCSYW</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and resources on the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities, provided by DJAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation progress overview: DJAG</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Advisory Group Meeting Summary, October 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation progress overview: DPC</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on engagement and communication strategy implementation: DPC</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council work program updates February to September 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation progress overview: DPC</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFV Strategy Agency Senior Officers Attendance 15 November 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 59: Referral Model</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 59: Referral Flowchart</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Domestic and Family Violence Court Trial in Southport. Griffith University. Summary and Final Reports January 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Domestic and Family Violence Court Trial in Southport. Griffith University. Interim Reports May 2016</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop the Hurting – End Domestic Violence Youth Campaign Evaluation (Phase 1): Overview. December 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop the Hurting – End Domestic Violence Youth Campaign Evaluation (Phase 2): Overview. July 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Closure Report 52</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Closure Report 55</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Closure Report 56</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Closure Report 58</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD counselling services Logan-Beenleigh: Funding Schedule</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD counselling services Gold Coast: Funding Schedule</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD counselling services Moreton: Funding Schedule</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD counselling services Logan-Beenleigh and Gold Coast: Request for Quote</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of a domestic and family violence victim throughout the protection order process: Workshop Slides</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date received</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Court Process Communications: Background</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Court Process Communications: Research Report, IPSOS</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Court Process Communications: Project Overview</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDV (Phase 1): project mandate</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDV (Phase 1) : lite project initiation document, September 2015</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDV (Phase 1): change management document</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDV Project Benefits Realisation Dashboard</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDV (Phase 1): project overview</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDV (Phase 1): end project report</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 91: Interim closure report</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Social Survey 2017 - Data (Demographics and domestic and family violence awareness questions)</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Social Survey 2018 - Data (Demographics and domestic and family violence awareness questions)</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government's workplace response to domestic and family violence: F, 12 July 2018 flagship evaluation. PWC</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship evaluation update, November 28 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council evaluation framework work group meeting, 12 July 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally appropriate justice responses in Queensland specialist Domestic and Family Violence Courts: Literature Review</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Implementation Evaluation Report for the Integrated Service Response Trial: Logan-Beenleigh, Mount Isa, Cherbourg sites</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Findings from KPMG-Initial Consultation Phase</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council Terms of Reference</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 Form: Stakeholder survey outcomes</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online DV1 form: project plan</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: usability testing strategy</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: usability testing outcomes</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: product roadmap</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: stakeholder evaluation</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: prepare your application for a protection order – online smart form, workshop slides</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJAG DV1 Innovation Award nomination form</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANROWS NCAS Survey 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVO form: analytics March 2017 to November 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply to change your DVO form: analytics</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVO form: analytics March 2018 to November 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: Usability Research Outcomes</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Interactive Showcase Report: ICJ, 17July 2015</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: discussion paper</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: project stakeholder map</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: co-design issue identification</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 form: co-design service design</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the DV1 Form and Reasons for Adjournment</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV4 form: Product Roadmap</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply to change your domestic violence order: Content Brief</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAQ domestic and family violence Duty Lawyer Service Review: Final Report, August 2016</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation capability intranet toolkit</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation capability intranet toolkit supporting videos</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander access to justice: Literature Review</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communications on courts processes:</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final recommendations report, July 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communications on courts processes:</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholder engagement map</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the Line Youth Campaign: Overview</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlwaysOn Campaign: GACC Stage 1</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlwaysOn Campaign: Communication Plan</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content for domestic and family violence campaigns matrix</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally sensitive domestic and family violence court process communications: ICJ</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Review and Advisory Board: Annual Report 2017-18</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council communique Cairns: May 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI Council meeting MacKay: August 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHPW supplied data: Response to Data Request</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence campaign DFVI council meeting update, 7 November 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Death review board Annual Report findings</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence Engagement and Communication Campaigns:</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence executive group: Agenda Paper Meeting 14, 23</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Family Violence prevention strategy campaign matrix</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV1 private applications: Stakeholder map</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP Data employee contacts</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Abuse Campaign Social Media materials Samples</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Abuse Campaign: GACC Stage 2</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email domestic and family violence Death review board briefing</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Service Response Trials: Early Implementation Evaluation Report</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiveLighter controlled cohort evaluation</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelighter mass media campaign evaluation</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National tobacco campaign evaluation</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Watch Toolkit</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Watch: Change the Story Report, 2015</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise, Refer, Respond uptake Data</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, Rights and Respectful Relationships: Level 1-2 learning materials, Victoria Government, April 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Relationships education: Final evaluation report technical appendix A</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Relationships education: Year 1 overview</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Relationships education: Year 2 overview</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Relationships staff survey tool</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of domestic and family violence screening tools in antenatal settings: KPMG</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign (phase 2): Evaluation</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign (phase 2): Process evaluation</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign GACC Stage 4</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign GACC Stage 5</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign (phase 1): Overview</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign (phase 2): Evaluation overview</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoptheHurting Campaign: Evaluation Methodology</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunSmart Continued impact evaluation</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ribbon Workforce accreditation data</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for Queensland Survey Data</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSYW supplied data: Response to Data Request</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJAG supplied data: Response to Data Request</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report by PSC on Queensland Government’s workplace response to Domestic and Family Violence</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google analytics for domestic and family violence website</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure report on recommendations 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 30</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure report recommendation 41</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure report recommendation 42</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAT evaluation framework</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAT pamphlet</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAT update 26 Feb 2019</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of ‘Respectful Relationships Education’</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI implementation update 1 Dec 2017 - 30 Nov 2018</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI media update 09 Feb – 22 Feb 2019</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFVI media update 23 Feb – 08 Mar 2019</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupting family violence program- QCS factsheet</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupting family violence program trial evaluation</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Response Implementation Update as of 28 Feb 2019</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external facing guides to support Queensland Procurement Policy</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Draws The Line – A3 poster</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Draws The Line - A5 poster</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Draws The Line – Pamphlet</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Draws The Line - TV advertisement</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Draws The Line - Women Centre advertisement</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Regional Council – Domestic Violence Taskforce meeting minute (07 Sep 2018)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Regional Council – Domestic Violence Taskforce meeting minute (21 Feb 2017)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Regional Council – Domestic Violence Taskforce meeting minute (23 Nov 2018)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Regional Council – Domestic Violence Taskforce meeting minute (25 May 2018)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay Regional Council – Domestic Violence Taskforce meeting minute (25 Nov 2016)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Queensland Advisory Council - Consultation report</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National DFV Strategy - Fourth Action Plan – Consultation summary report</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes including communication from DCSYW regarding perpetrator programs</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on discussion between DPC and DCSYW regarding the KWSITH Technology Trials</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on discussion between DPC and DCSYW regarding the perpetrator programs</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on discussion between DPC and DESBT regarding action 51 (Recommendation 89c: Annual VET investment plan)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on discussion between DPC and Mackay Regional Council regarding Mackay Draws The Line</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on discussion between DPC and QCS regarding perpetrator interventions</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on domestic and family violence issues impacting on migrant women</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on interview with the Commissioner, prepared by QPS</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Safe places – Australian Government – Department of Social Services</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project plan for the evaluation of the technology trial - KWSITH</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality framework for Men's DFV program</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Procurement Policy and guide for government buyers</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilling Queenslanders for Work - Good news stories</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of action 38 (Recommendation 11), prepared by DCDSS</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled survey for sector profiling activity regarding perpetrator programs</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Date received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ribbon Accreditation project plan</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHPW’s Table of feedback regarding the use of the DFV guide</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland’s Plan to respond to domestic and family violence against people with disability</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review to address the impacts of domestic and family violence on people with disability (People With Disability Australia)</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland’s Framework for Action – Reshaping our Approach to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander domestic and family violence</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Actions targeting diverse population groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions targeting diverse population groups</th>
<th>Foundational element</th>
<th>Supporting outcome</th>
<th>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</th>
<th>Older people</th>
<th>People from CALD backgrounds</th>
<th>Rural and remote communities</th>
<th>People who identify as LGBTIQ</th>
<th>People with disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct comprehensive market research including identifying the specific needs and challenges surrounding domestic violence in the LGBTIQ community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work in partnership with the CALD community and the domestic and family violence service system to develop culturally appropriate services and supports.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop specific communication messages and channels, as part of the rolling engagement and communication program, targeting the LGBTIQ community to raise awareness, remove stigmas around reporting and advise where to report.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions targeting diverse population groups</td>
<td>Foundational element</td>
<td>Supporting outcome</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</td>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>People from CALD backgrounds</td>
<td>Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>People who identify as LGBTIQ</td>
<td>People with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include elder abuse as a specific element in the comprehensive engagement and communication strategy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on the findings of the review into the prevalence and characteristics of elder abuse. Continue to fund an annual elder abuse awareness campaign.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

go for support regarding domestic and family violence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions targeting diverse population groups</th>
<th>Foundational element</th>
<th>Supporting outcome</th>
<th>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</th>
<th>Older people</th>
<th>People from CALD backgrounds</th>
<th>Rural and remote communities</th>
<th>People who identify as LGBTIQ</th>
<th>People with disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop, trial and evaluate contemporary integrated domestic and family violence service delivery models, in consultation with the sector, in three locations (one urban community, one regional community and one discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community). In consultation with the sector finalise the foundational work needed to support implementation of these trials including development of a common risk assessment and management framework, information sharing guidelines, and a process for managing high-risk cases.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a funding and investment model to guide future investment in the domestic and family violence service system that addresses specific service delivery issues, including in rural and remote communities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a review into the specific challenges faced by people with disability impacted by domestic and family violence.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions targeting diverse population groups</td>
<td>Foundational element</td>
<td>Supporting outcome</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</td>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>People from CALD backgrounds</td>
<td>Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>People who identify as LGBTIQ</td>
<td>People with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the Elder Abuse Prevention Unit and the Seniors Legal and Support Services to better respond to elder abuse in regional and remote areas and under-serviced metropolitan areas from 2017–18.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make representations to the Commonwealth Government regarding matters relating to funding of carers, informed through consultation with carers and stakeholders; the review into the prevalence and characteristics of elder abuse recommendation 11); and findings of the Parliamentary Committee inquiry into the adequacy of existing financial protections for Queensland’s seniors.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with partner agencies to ensure domestic and family violence responses and services developed and implemented meet the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to identify opportunities to streamline systems for engagement of interpreters for civil domestic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions targeting diverse population groups</td>
<td>Foundational element</td>
<td>Supporting outcome</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</td>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>People from CALD backgrounds</td>
<td>Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>People who identify as LGBTIQ</td>
<td>People with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver changes to facilitate the electronic transfer of information relating to applications and court results between Queensland Courts and the QPS. Produce simple, easy to understand forms for an application for protection orders and publish communications to explain the court process, including communications focusing on Queensland’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and diverse communities.</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot a new intervention model for fathers who expose their children to domestic and family violence in Mount Isa, Sunshine Coast and Moreton Bay areas (NOTE: Only the pilot in Mount Isa is considered to be directed toward a rural and remote community.)</td>
<td>3, 6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions targeting diverse population groups</td>
<td>Foundational element</td>
<td>Supporting outcome</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</td>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>People from CALD backgrounds</td>
<td>Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>People who identify as LGBTIQ</td>
<td>People with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update the Professional Practice Standards: Working with men who perpetrate domestic and family violence, broadening the scope to include individual counselling, culturally appropriate approaches to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, young offenders and provision of information to respondents appearing at court.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the results of the independent evaluation of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court trial, the Queensland Government will invest in the specialist domestic and family violence court program prioritising high needs locations. The evaluation will inform government on best practice elements for the specialist domestic and family violence court approach. We will undertake work on how to achieve a specialist approach for rural and remote areas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions targeting diverse population groups</td>
<td>Foundational element</td>
<td>Supporting outcome</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</td>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>People from CALD backgrounds</td>
<td>Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>People who identify as LGBTIQ</td>
<td>People with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with community justice groups in discrete communities to develop and maintain culturally appropriate domestic and family violence justice and service responses in each community. Engage with community justice groups in each community to build local authority structures.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine further relevant policies and guidelines in accordance with the revised Queensland Language Services Guidelines to strengthen engagement of interpreters in domestic and family violence occurrences.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F : DoE case study – Respectful Relationships and Our Watch pilot

F.1 Overview of case study

The Respectful Relationships Education program (RREP) is a primary prevention program focused on influencing behaviour change to prevent undesirable social consequences such as domestic and family violence.\textsuperscript{150} It contributes to instilling a school culture based on:

- developing and maintaining respectful relationships
- respecting self
- gender equality.

The RREP has been available to schools since 2016\textsuperscript{151} with implementation on a voluntary basis. In 2018\textsuperscript{152}, the DoE commenced a pilot to support 10 schools in the southeast corner of Queensland to build on and enhance DoE’s existing programs and initiatives using the Our Watch whole-of-school approach to respectful relationships and gender equity, beyond the classroom or curriculum. The RREP resources and materials are one part of this.

This case study comprises one action under the Second Action Plan for which the DoE holds responsibility:

- Continue to provide information to principals on the range of programs available to support the implementation of RRE programs. A range of measures will be established for schools to capture the implementation of RRE programs.

This action is aligned with supporting outcome two in the Second Action Plan: respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour are embedded in our community. Definitions associated with this action are:

- **Respectful relationships education (RRE)** – RRE is a broad term to describe a holistic approach to the primary prevention of domestic and family violence and gender-based violence. RRE is based on theory and practice for preventing domestic and family violence and focuses specifically on preventing the underlying drivers of domestic and family violence and gender-based violence. There are a range of RRE resources and programs available to schools. The DoE’s (RREP) is one of those resources.

- **Respectful relationships education program (RREP)** – In 2016, the DoE developed the RREP in response to the domestic and family violence Taskforce report and recommendations. The RREP is a Prep to Year 12 program and is aligned to the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (HPE). It is available to all Queensland schools via appropriate online platforms.

- **Our Watch pilot** – In 2017, DoE partnered with Our Watch to pilot a whole-school approach to RRE in 10 Queensland state primary schools. The focus of the pilot is on implementing and evaluating a whole-school approach to RRE. It involves professional development for


staff, auditing current policies and processes, engaging parents to reinforce messages about respect and equality received at school and 10 hours of curriculum instruction, for students in Years 1 and 2, has also been implemented and is currently being evaluated.

F.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following a consultation with the DoE and the DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Outcome question two (SO2), intermediate outcome 2.1:** To what extent has the school community shown an improved understanding of the importance of Respectful Relationships and non-violent behaviour?
- **Outcome question two (SO2), intermediate outcome 2.2:** To what extent has there been an increase in the capacity of schools to implement Respectful Relationships education?
- **Outcome question two (SO2), intermediate outcome 2.3:** Is there an increased awareness within the school community of the value of Respectful Relationships education?

The overarching research questions take into consideration the stage of implementation and operation of the action; the key questions include:

1. What facilitates uptake and implementation of RRE in the school setting?
2. What are the barriers to uptake and implementation of RRE in the school setting and how might these be overcome?
3. What early evidence is there that we are achieving the outcomes sought (e.g., improved understanding of the importance and value of Respectful Relationships, increased capacity to deliver RRE)?
4. How does the Our Watch model contribute to RRE? What are the features of Our Watch that complement and add value to RRE? (e.g., improved understanding of the importance and value of Respectful Relationships, increased capacity to deliver RRE)?
5. How might the essential components of Our Watch be implemented at scale?

F.3 Data sources
The following primary and secondary data sources were used to inform this case study:

- DoE interim recommendation closure report: Recommendation 24-27 RRE Program (Approved on 10 October 2016 by Dr Jim Watterson, Director-General, DoE);
- One 1-hour focus group with project delivery team from the DoE; and
- Two 1-hour semi-structured interviews with two schools, one involved in use of the online resources related to RRE and one involved in the Our Watch pilot.

It should be noted that a flagship evaluation of the Our Watch pilot is currently being undertaken by Deakin University. However, findings from this flagship evaluation are not available at the time of writing this report.

F.4 Limitations
This case study draws on a small sample size – one principal from a school participating in the Our Watch pilot and one participating in RRE (including RREP and RRE through WRA’s Breaking the Silence Schools program). While it is important to note this limitation, the findings are nonetheless consistent with themes from the review of the Second Action Plan, other case studies and, (based on verbal feedback), with emerging findings of the evaluation of the Our Watch pilot. The purpose of this case study is to provide a detailed example of themes from the review of the Second Action Plan, and not to provide a thematic evaluation of the Our Watch pilot.

F.5 Overview of the action
This action is overseen by DoE. In response to recommendations 24-26 of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, the DoE developed the RREP to be delivered to students in Prep to Year 12. The RREP takes a developmental approach to content and delivery, encompassing learning opportunities that help children and young people to build respectful relationships in their lives.
The Palaszczuk Government partnered with Our Watch to deliver the 18-month pilot RRE program tackling issues such as domestic and family violence, respect for women and girls, compassion and gender equality. Queensland state primary schools in the South East region, had the opportunity to submit an expression-of-interest to participate in the pilot, with 10 schools selected.

On 21 February 2018, Queensland’s Education Minister, Grace Grace MP, officially launched the pilot, ‘Creating a violence free future: RRE in Primary Schools’ at Eagleby South State (hereby referred to as the ‘Our Watch pilot’). This is one of the 10 schools where the Our Watch whole-school approach is currently being piloted. The focus of the pilot is on implementing and evaluating a whole-school approach to RRE. The pilot involves professional development for staff, auditing current policies and processes as well as engaging parents to reinforce messages regarding respect and equality received at school. It uses the Our Watch RRE Toolkit, which guides schools step-by-step, through developing an individualised whole-school approach to implementing RRE. Ten hours of curriculum instruction, for students in Years 1 and 2, has also been implemented.

A program logic of the action is shown in Figure F.1.

It should be noted that the Our Watch model is currently being piloted in schools in southeast Queensland due to the practicalities of providing central support from one full-time equivalent based at DoE. This should be accounted for in consideration of case study findings.

**Research question one: What facilitates uptake and implementation of Respectful Relationships education in the school setting?**

Several enablers of uptake and implementation were identified by both the Our Watch pilot school and non-Our Watch pilot school. These include:

- Leadership – recognising the issue and prioritising prevention
- Aligning RRE and the Our Watch pilot with staff professional development and curriculum
- Whole-of-school approach to embedding RRE
- Implementation support to protect program fidelity (Our Watch pilot school only)

**Leadership – recognising the need for RRE and prioritising prevention**

Stakeholders identified that an important enabler of uptake and implementing RRE is buy-in from the school leadership who can then motivate and engage the broader school community. In particular, given the voluntary nature of the RRE, the extent to which the school principal and/or deputy principal believed responding to domestic and family violence to be important was essential to the initial uptake and successful implementation of RRE. This was true both for the school...
participating in the Our Watch Pilot and the school implementing the DoE's RREP outside the pilot. DoE noted that there were examples of other schools who had taken the initiative to successfully implement RRE as part of other whole-of-school approaches, such as WRA. In this sense, school leaders recognising domestic and family violence and their role in responding to and preventing domestic and family violence prompted schools to take up an RRE program. For the non-Our Watch pilot school, there was recognition that this was linked to a broader inclusive education agenda. This school leadership and initiative was noted anecdotally to be often associated with school leaders who identify domestic and family violence as a known issue affecting families in their school community.

Aligning RRE with staff professional development and curriculum

Participants from the Our Watch pilot and non-Our Watch pilot both commented that aligning RRE with staff professional development and performance plans was helpful to encourage staff engagement with the program. It was reported that the professional training and online resources were useful resources for upskilling educators.

In terms of the uptake of the RREP, a representative from a non-pilot school commented that the implementation of RREP materials should pivot on the existing components of the school curriculum. As such, rather than implementing RRE as a standalone program, it was useful to integrate RREP with current educational resources and/or culture-change activities at the school.

Given the need to balance competing priorities of the school, a representative from the non-Our Watch pilot school commented on the need to provide the endorsement and support from the DoE to implement RREP as part of the curriculum. More than just an initial permission to proceed, this approval and support signalled by the DoE encourages schools to allow time for teachers and educators to implement RREP, build capability in RREP and share their experiences of the RREP.

Whole-of-school approach

To maximise the educational outcomes, stakeholders from both the Our Watch pilot and non-Our Watch pilot school highlighted the need to embed the RRE messages into the school’s culture by adopting a whole-of-school approach. For one school, this included demonstrating respectful behaviour by assisting children and family experiencing domestic and family violence during the enrolment period, or prior to school term commencement.

Implementation support

During consultation, a participant in the Our Watch pilot school noted that the availability of dedicated support for implementation was critical to its success. Our Watch was able to improve staff capability through initial training, review and provide advice on the school’s proposed implementation plan, and share insights from other jurisdictions that the school could apply to their context. They felt it enabled them to do the program justice, and instilled them with the confidence they could implement it properly. Our Watch’s involvement in this way assisted with the fidelity of implementation. Program fidelity comprises five components: adherence, quality of delivery, program differentiation, exposure to the intervention, and participant responsiveness or involvement.\(^\text{153}\) Fidelity is important to ensure the intended outcomes are achieved. For example, incorrect conclusions about the effectiveness of a program could be made if it is the implementation of the program, rather than the program itself, that may be limiting effectiveness. In this way, the Our Watch pilot’s role in providing implementation support enhanced adherence to the intent of the program and thus the likelihood of the school achieving the intended outcomes of RRE.

Research question two: What are the barriers to uptake and implementation of Respectful Relationships education in the school setting and how might these be overcome?

Through consultation with DoE, as well as representatives from schools in the Our Watch pilot and those not participating in the pilot, several barriers to the Our Watch pilot and RREP uptake were identified. As outlined earlier, the voluntary nature of RRE means that uptake requires the ability to

recognise domestic and family violence as an issue that needs to be addressed through prevention, the initiative to identify an appropriate RRE and implement it, and motivation and investment from school leadership.

Second, the capacity of the school to implement RRE, including RREP, can be a barrier including having the knowledge and confidence to implement RRE in an evidence-based manner, and the time to implement it with competing priorities. For example, the non-Our Watch pilot school couched RREP within a broader concept of ‘inclusive education’, and reflected they were able to adopt WRA and RREP because of their significant experience in inclusive education. In contrast, the Our Watch pilot school was relatively new to RRE, and identified they relied on external support to ensure fidelity of implementation.

Staff capability was also a cited barrier to implementation in some instances. One of the consultees commented that RRE is a sophisticated program of teaching that requires high levels of emotional intelligence skills to deal with complex situations. Selecting the appropriately skilled educator within the school to lead implementation is essential. From the experience of the consultee, there were also instances where staff did not all see the need for the program; however, after providing background information and evidence, these personnel appeared to become more engaged. This is where the role of Our Watch was important, as they delivered the initial presentation which assisted in creating buy-in from staff upfront. They also provided training to the school implementation team to build capability.

It was also noted during a consultation that the materials were not always culturally appropriate and tailored to students from diverse population groups, which might prevent uptake. This includes that the program resources may not be suited for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students or students with disability. To overcome this, stakeholders commented on the need to obtain a thorough understanding of the needs of students from these cohorts and plan and develop materials to meet their needs. It is acknowledged that work has been initiated in some specific locations of Queensland, with the assistance of DoE, to refine the materials.

F.8 Research question three: What early evidence is there that we are achieving the outcomes sought (i.e. improved understanding of the importance and value of Respectful Relationships, increased capacity to deliver Respectful Relationships education)?

For educators, resources have reportedly been useful in informing and upskilling educators. They provide information that challenges educators’ knowledge and experience in this field, and encourages and supports them to explore this topic further. For the Our Watch pilot, stakeholders commented during consultations that there have been early signs of Year 1 and Year 2 teachers having increased knowledge, advocacy, developed capacity and becoming champions to represent the RRE and engaging other staff, as a result of staff development.

There were also benefits at the whole-of-school level. For the non-Our Watch pilot, they noted it was important that a whole-of-school approach was adopted, and linked it to an inclusive school more generally. In this sense they expanded RREP to RRE, including also adopting WRA. These initiatives set the fundamental foundation for positive changes within the school culture. For example, schools have become more aware of using gender-neutral language and gendered roles for students - assigning student leadership roles based on merit, rather than assigned to one male and one female student.

There was limited data available to assess early evidence of achievement of outcomes in students and the school community at this stage. The findings from the flagship evaluation should provide more insight. Anecdotally, however, consultations indicated that some early signs of change have been observed.
F.9  Research question four: How does the Our Watch model contribute to Respectful Relationships? What are the features of Our Watch that complement and add value to Respectful Relationships? (i.e., improved understanding of the importance and value of Respectful Relationships, increase capacity to deliver Respectful Relationships education)

The purpose of the Our Watch pilot is to provide support to schools implementing RRE. There are a number of ways in which it does this including: providing professional development with school leadership teams, teachers and other school staff; support in planning and implementing a whole-school approach; and hands-on support as required by the schools. At its core, the dedicated support provided through the Our Watch pilot strengthened the uptake and implementation of RRE, and contributed to increased capability among educators.

From the outset, the pilot assisted with creating buy-in among educators, by presenting the evidence-base. This assisted to ensure everyone within the school community recognised the issue and the importance of addressing it.

The model created value by building capability among educators and the school leadership, which contributed to the program fidelity. For educators, this occurred in extra training to build confidence and capability in program delivery. For the school principal, it involved reviewing the implementation plan, ensuring the six-step stage was followed, and sharing knowledge and insights. In terms of the training, the school principal commented that they were not sure they would have been successful in implementing the program without the training. They expressed similar views in terms of the hands-on support, which contributed to their confidence and ability to successfully implement the model in the school. Having an expert from Our Watch provide support enabled the school to develop an appropriate implementation plan and timelines. This created confidence at the classroom and the school level, enabling RRE to be embedded within the school in new ways of working for business-as-usual activities.

The foundational research and toolkit included within the Our Watch RRE approach enabled the school to address the issues of domestic and family violence and gender inequality through business-as-usual.

The embedded position of someone from Our Watch within the DoE also brings something new, which is unlikely to be available in schools without a position dedicated to implementation support. That is, experience and expertise, foundational research and an awareness of the evidence base, and support for troubleshooting new issues that emerge over time.

It is important to note that the need for this expertise may differ by school readiness. The school consulted that had not been involved in the Our Watch pilot was led by someone who reported having decades of experience in inclusive education and as such was comfortable implementing RREP. However for schools new to RRE or similar initiatives, the learning curve may be greater. While it is possible to implement RRE in the absence of dedicated implementation support, there is a risk that schools new to such initiatives may be impeded by the barriers outlined in research question two. This is likely to affect fidelity of implementation, and ultimately quality.

F.10  Research question five: How might the essential components of Our Watch be implemented at scale?

This case study identified some features of the Our Watch pilot for which consideration should be given to implementing at scale if we are to improve the quality of outcomes achieved through the RRE. One feature is the capacity for someone with the appropriate experience in RRE to provide implementation support to schools. Commentary from stakeholder consultations indicated that it may be useful to have this support at a local level as a regionally-based role. In practice, this could be a dedicated position responsible for a group of schools within a particular region. This position would provide the training to implementation staff at schools (one session could be held with multiple schools for efficiency), and providing implementation support to school principals including ad hoc advice as required. It was suggested by the pilot school that to scale the pilot, the embedded officer role could facilitate local connections with other RRE schools to encourage them to share experiences and learnings. In this sense, schools could act in a peer-support capacity, noting there is always a risk this may dilute implementation fidelity.
Another useful feature of the Our Watch model is the whole-of-school approach, which enables the embedding of RRE within business-as-usual activities. It should also be noted that other schools taking alternative whole-of-school approaches, such as WRA, have also reportedly had successes embedding RRE.

One potential opportunity for scaling up implementation was identified by engaging with experts to revise and refresh RREP resources to accommodate for cultural sensitivity and special needs such as for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and students with disabilities.

F.11 Conclusion
For RRE, the role of the school principal is critical in identifying the need for an approach to prevent domestic and family violence, and creating buy-in within the school community. The Our Watch pilot can assist with this, by providing a presentation that outlines the evidence-base from a respected and trusted source of information.

The embedded Our Watch pilot officer within the DoE was also essential in providing implementation support to the pilot school, and building workforce capability. This is particularly important given both the pilot and non-pilot school reflected on the importance of adopting a whole-of-school approach. The role includes providing ad hoc support and training to grow confidence and capability in implementing the RRE as intended. Scaling the concept of an embedded officer could be undertaken based on need or regionally-focused. That is, focusing on those schools that may require the most support if they are new to RRE. Connecting schools locally to provide peer-support and facilitate sharing of experiences may also assist in scaling this.
Appendix G: Communications strategy case study

G.1 Overview of the case study
This case study comprises the following actions within the Second Action Plan:

- Design an audience-tested long-term advertising/media campaign, informed by market research, as a part of the engagement and communication strategy.
- Include elder abuse as a specific element in the comprehensive engagement and communication strategy.
- Develop specific communication messages and channels, as part of the rolling engagement and communication program, targeting the LGBTI community to raise awareness, remove stigmas around reporting and advise where to go for support regarding domestic and family violence.
- Engage and utilise appropriate male leaders to raise awareness of domestic and family violence under the engagement and communication strategy.
- Develop and distribute a Queensland media guide as a component of the rolling engagement and communication strategy.

These actions are aligned with supporting outcomes one and two in the Second Action Plan. The specific communication campaigns and engagement activities within scope of this case study include:

- Youth campaign
- LGBTIQ campaign
- Always-On including Help-seeking campaign
- Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month
- Elders Abuse campaign
- Bystander campaign

Additional engagement activities identified by the DPC under the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention and Communication Strategy include:

- Community Grants Program
- Media Guide
- White Ribbon Breakfasts
- Video series
- Grassroots engagement
- Academic Literature Review

The case study is a 'meta-analysis' of the documents and evaluations developed and delivered that relate to the communications and engagement initiatives, supplemented by primary data collection. It is not an evaluation of the individual communications campaigns or engagement initiatives.

G.2 Lines of inquiry
The key research questions for this case study were formulated following a consultation with the DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes and sub-evaluation questions:

- **Process question one:** Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?
• **Process question five:** How effective have the governance arrangements been for delivering the Second Action Plan?

• **Outcome question one:** To what extent do Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence? (Supporting outcome one – immediate outcomes 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5)

• **Outcome question two:** To what extent are respectful relationships and non-violent behaviours embedded in our community (supporting outcome one - immediate outcome 2.5)

The overarching research questions take into consideration the stage of the project. The key questions include:

- Research question one: What progress has been made in delivering the communication and engagement initiatives, including actions under the Second Action Plan, the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, and related activities?
- Research question two: What has worked well and what could be improved upon in designing, developing and delivering the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy?
- Research question three: How can a communications campaign be effectively tailored to meet the needs of diverse population groups?
- Research question four: How effective has the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, including the communications campaigns as a collective, been?

### G.3 Data sources

The development of this case study has been informed by a review of secondary data sources, supplemented by primary research, including but not limited to:

- One 90 minute focus group with the DPC
- Four 60 minute focus groups with other implementing agencies including DCDSS and DCSYW Communications Services
- One 45 minute consultation with other jurisdictions (New South Wales)

A wide range of data pertinent to all communication campaigns and the overriding strategy was reviewed in developing the case study. In summary, these documents included:

- Overarching Domestic and Family Violence Engagement and Communication Strategy (2016-2026)
- Government Advertising and Communication Committee (GACC) submissions
- Communication and engagement material provided including creative materials, briefing documentation, and links to published content and materials
- Individual communication campaign evaluation reports
- Web analytics data on campaign materials.

### G.4 The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy

The Queensland Government’s Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy (Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy) was developed in 2015-16 by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in response to Recommendations 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 30. With a funding allocation of $9.3m to the DPC, the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy was of a significant scale and required collaboration across multiple agencies and coordination from within the DPC.

---

154 Funding figures reflect the funding allocated to the DPC over this period. Some initiatives under the Domestic and family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy were not specifically funded from the $9.3m.
The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy was developed to align to the broader ten-year Strategy through supporting outcome one and two. In addition, it sits alongside the Second Action Plan. Several of the actions within the Second Action Plan relate to specific campaigns and engagement activities. These are then planned out in more detail with an overarching narrative in the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy. It broadly comprises of two types of communications; communication campaigns and other engagement activities.

Table G.1 Initiatives within scope of the Domestic and Family Violence Engagement and Communication Strategy for 2016-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaigns and initiatives</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major campaigns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth campaign</td>
<td>Co-creation project partnering with an external agency to deliver a meaningful audience led social marketing solution to effect real change and shift attitudes in relation to domestic and family violence. Workshops were used to develop media messaging, and how these messages should be conveyed. Messaging also targeted state-wide youth through television and other broad public media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTIQ campaign</td>
<td>Develop and deliver an audience-led solution to raising awareness of domestic and family violence in the LGBTIQ+ communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always-On including Help-Seeking campaign</td>
<td>Year-round media promotion in support of domestic and family violence prevention targeting primarily victims and adult Queenslanders with secondary target audiences including younger Queenslanders (12-17 years), bystanders and the LGBTIQ community. The Help-Seeking campaign was a Christmas promotion targeting victims to connect them to support services over the December – February period where instances of domestic and family violence increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Abuse campaign</td>
<td>A campaign delivered to target elder abuse and where to go for support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander campaign</td>
<td>State-wide awareness campaign incorporating existing academic research findings as the first stage of promoting bystander intervention of domestic and family violence. Communication vehicles to include television and broad public media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engagement activities and other initiatives**

| Domestic and family violence Prevention Month | Through community grants, actively support Queensland communities to undertake local awareness raising activities to encourage communities and individuals to take a stand to stop domestic and family violence. |
The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy outlined the following five objectives:

- **Government sponsorship:** position the Queensland Government as a facilitator of strategic relationships that will drive cultural change at a public level.
- **Knowledge of our target audience:** understand the target audience and their driving factors that will bring about change.
- **Activation of champions:** proactively engage with key community leaders to encourage genuine partnerships and create momentum for them to champion change.
- **Building on extensive initiatives:** maximise the opportunity to integrate across existing campaigns and programs that complete the picture.
- **Bipartisanship:** build flexibility and robustness within the structure to ensure scalability and longevity across the life of the strategy.

These objectives served to inform the development of the communication and engagement approach, to ensure consistent messaging, channels and tools across all communities and groups within Queensland.

To make a significant shift in community attitudes and behaviours towards a zero tolerance to domestic and family violence, the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy identified five key messages to deliver in communication campaigns developed:

1. Domestic and family violence is unacceptable
2. Domestic and family violence is not just physical – it comes in many forms
3. Help is available – here’s how
4. You can do something
5. Specialised support is available – seek help

The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy has set a goal to change community attitudes and behaviours such that within the next 10 years Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence. While behaviour change and influencing culture are documented as part of the longer term 10-year Strategy, the first three years of the Strategy (i.e. the initiatives undertaken to date) focused on attitudes and awareness - “Only by first changing societal attitudes through awareness and understanding, can the goal of ending violence be realised.” This aligns with the KAB model, promoting knowledge creation, which then influences attitudes and ultimately behaviours. The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy is a component of the approach to be taken to change societal attitudes and influence culture.

G.5 Research question one: What progress has been made in delivering the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy

Engagement and communications initiatives under The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy 2016-2026 focused on awareness of and attitudes towards domestic and family violence. Specifically, the Second Action Plan aimed to raise awareness of types of domestic and family violence, increase knowledge and commence influencing attitudes, capability and confidence, leading to increased intent to change behaviour over the longer-term.

The Second Action Plan included the following specific actions:

- Design an audience-tested long-term advertising/media campaign, informed by market research, as a part of the engagement and communication strategy
- Include elder abuse as a specific element in the comprehensive engagement and communication strategy
- Develop specific communication messages and channels, as part of the rolling engagement and communication program, targeting the LGBTIQ community to raise awareness, remove stigmas around reporting and advise where to go for support regarding domestic and family violence
- Engage and utilise appropriate male leaders to raise awareness of domestic and family violence under the engagement and communication strategy, and
- Develop and distribute a Queensland media guide as a component of the rolling engagement and communication program.

These five actions in the Second Action plan were addressed with the development of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy which contained 30 planned engagement and communication activities and initiatives to be delivered by the 2018-19 financial year. Most of these 30 activities and initiatives have been completed or progressed. This demonstrates that overall, progress was made across a broad range and number of intended activities. These engagement and communication initiatives were implemented by various Queensland Government departments and community organisations, with DPC having a significant role in the major campaigns and supporting co-ordination.

The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy outlined a schedule of delivery dates of initiatives. While according to these scheduled dates, progress may have been hindered at times, this may not be a bad thing as additional time allowed for improved understanding of the issues, leading to stronger creative outcomes. Three of the originally approved communication campaigns were successfully progressed but experienced some delays to delivery


156 The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy suggested a schedule of phased dates for the Bystander, LGBTIQ and Youth Campaign however the actual implementation
due to appropriate evolution through the design and delivery stages. For example, essential informative research within the Queensland population led to changes in the intended messaging of the Bystander campaign. This subsequently extended the period of time originally planned in the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, to reshape the creative content and messaging and ensure this was appropriately tested with Queenslanders prior to delivery.

Other learnings about the timing of campaigns included recommendations from external creative and media scheduling agencies to avoid periods of potential saturation or overlap with other campaigns (by Queensland Government or Commonwealth). Some stakeholders interviewed as a part of this case study also highlighted that, in hindsight, a better understanding of approval processes and internal timelines could have assisted in some instances to ensure progress within the intended timeframes was achieved.

Two phases of the grass roots campaign were not continued after the pilot as intended. The outcomes from the pilot in one community found that there may be benefit in focusing on service delivery improvements first, so services were sufficiently equipped to action any flow-on effects from the campaign. Such system level and service delivery improvements were part of the broader reform agenda, but at the time of the pilot were yet to be rolled out and the response is not necessarily wholly led by the domestic and family violence reforms.

G.5.1 Progress of major communication campaigns
A key feature of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy is the six communications campaigns. At times the timelines of delivery of these campaigns were adjusted to allow for refinement of initiatives as required, incorporating feedback and creating a refined focus for progressing particular campaigns:

- In 2017 the first phases of Bystander, Youth, Help-seekers, and Always On campaigns did not progress as planned and more time was taken to refine them before they were launched in market in 2018. Therefore, the second phases of Bystander and Youth campaigns were not conducted in 2018.
- In 2019 the third phases of Bystander and Youth campaigns were not conducted, with the likelihood that Bystander campaign may be repeated in market in July.
- In 2018-19, delivery was focused on the targeted campaigns of Youth Phase 2, and the LGBTIQ campaign.

These communication campaigns are delivering messages to raise awareness across different population segments and spectrum of delivery mechanisms. Importantly, these illustrate that in their totality, the campaigns cover the five messages intended by the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy. This is demonstrated in the infographic on the following pages.

The infographic highlights the major campaigns and their alignment with the five key messages intended by the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy.

dates varied from the scheduled dates, after the design and development recommended a revised schedule of phasing which was supported by formative research.
### Purpose*

#### Youth Stop the Hurting
- Increasing young Queenslanders’ awareness that:
  - Domestic and family violence is unhealthy behaviour
  - Domestic and family violence isn’t always physical abuse (i.e. it can also be financial, emotional or psychological abuse)
  - Support options are available.

#### Elder Abuse
Aims to increase community understanding of the behaviours that constitute elder abuse and encourage family members, friends, carers and neighbours of older people whom they suspect may be experiencing elder abuse, to assist the older person to connect with available support services.

#### Bystander
Raise awareness of domestic and family violence and provide Queenslanders with information on how to safely and appropriately intervene when they encounter or suspect a domestic and family violence situation.

#### Always on
- Raise awareness of domestic and family violence
- Ensure visibility of the issue and victim support options are maintained at a high level on an ongoing basis

### Campaign status as of Jan 2019

#### Youth Stop the Hurting
- **Phase 1:** June to September 2017
- **Phase 2:** May to June 2018; Sept – Nov 2018; Dec – Feb 2019

#### Elder Abuse
- June to August in 2016, 2017 and 2018

#### Bystander
- April to August 2018

### Media channels campaign elements

#### Youth Stop the Hurting
- Television
- Cinema
- Out of Home
- Facebook
- Spotify
- YouTube
- Music competition

#### Elder Abuse
- Out of home including co-branded posters
- Help cards
- Brochure mail out and distribution
- Campaign videos in medical waiting rooms
- Media and Corporate partnerships

#### Bystander
- Television
- Cinema
- Transit panels
- Bus stop and city signage
- Convenience advertising

### Pending campaign activity

#### Youth Stop the Hurting
- Workshops
- Website
- VEVO
- Snapchat

#### Elder Abuse
- YouTube
- Twitter
- Website
- Senior social media channel
- Thriving Communities social media channel
- Landmark lighting

#### Bystander
- A new campaign is scheduled to run June to August 2019

### Target audience

#### Youth Stop the Hurting
- **Primary:** Youth 12 – 17 years
- **Secondary:** Adults 18+

#### Elder Abuse
- **Primary:** Friends, family and neighbours of those experiencing elder abuse
- **Secondary:** Health professionals, community service providers

#### Bystander
- **Primary:** Adults 18+ yrs
- **Secondary:** Youths 12 – 17 years

### Key messages

#### Legend for Key messages
- Domestic and family violence is unacceptable
- Domestic and family violence is not just physical – it comes in many forms
- Help is available – here’s how
- You can do something
- Specialised support is available – seek help

---
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G.5.1 Progress of other engagement initiatives

Additional resources including grants and videos also show progress in terms of using a range of channels to communicate about the reforms and awareness raising more generally across Queensland.

A range of video resources were developed by Queensland Government agencies, produced by DPC and other Departments on request and on an ad-hoc basis. The videos were used in a variety of ways such as being published on the Queensland Government YouTube channel, on the domestic and family violence website and to support other activities such as White Ribbon Day Breakfasts.

The Video Series was an activity that encouraged community groups, government agencies and organisations to showcase their efforts in communicating prevention messaging initially addressing the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, partnership initiatives or domestic and family violence month grants. 55 videos were uploaded to the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ website, and across a diverse range of community groups, sporting clubs, workplaces and schools.

In addition to the video resources, there were 75 registered events for domestic and family violence prevention month in 2017-18. In addition, there were 35 successful grant recipients of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month Grant program – 13 of which were specifically targeting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Events funded typically received a higher dollar value and attracted more participants than in previous years, particularly in regional locations across Queensland. Supporting outcome three (Chapter 7) has more detailed information on Domestic Violence Prevention Month Events and grants.

G.6 Research question two: What has worked well and what could be improved upon in designing, developing and delivering the engagement initiatives

In order to effectively deliver different initiatives across the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, there were a number of key success factors in the design, development and delivery of initiatives. The inputs for evaluating this research question include:

- A series of interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders, implementing agencies and external providers were conducted.
- An external review of the appropriateness of the manner in which initiatives were progressed using documentation supplied by DPC and implementing agencies.

A four-pronged philosophy aligning with complex change theory application was intended to guide the design, development and implementation of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy. These four elements were:

- **Foundation**: What we need to change – establish a resilient foundation through evidence building, assessment and identification (design phase)
- **Transition**: How we move closer to achieving change – develop a process to help transform from where we are into a program designed to bring about change (development)
- **Execution**: How we contribute to change – develop targeted programs informed by the foundation building process that are executed with precision and supported by robust systems, processes and resources (delivery)
- **Evaluate**: How we know we are changing – evaluate and assess program initiatives and whom we target to ensure we continue to make impact where it counts most (post-delivery).

The four-pronged philosophy guided the enquiry into what worked well and what could be improved throughout the design, development and delivery of the communications initiatives.

**G.6.1 Design**

Key features of the design phase that served as enablers are the **evidence base, primary research** and **corporate knowledge**.

The overarching Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy was appropriately designed with strong evidence-based foundations, taking into account findings
from the Queensland Government’s ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report and actions committed to under the Second Action Plan. The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy emphasised the need for a foundation of robust and holistic evidence base to be gathered in the initial stages. The DPC and other campaign owners employed a combination of evidence sources to inform all stages of design including:

- **Primary qualitative and quantitative research** commissioned to specifically inform the DPC on the current status quo of Queensland attitudes and behaviour (including primary market research and the establishment of the Queensland Social Survey).
- **Utilisation of domestic and international research** already existing on the issue of domestic and family violence and its nuances in certain target audiences such as youth, LGBTIQ and older persons.
- **A formal academic literature review** of all Queensland Government and Federal Government domestic and family violence research targeting Queensland, conducted prior to the finalisation of the communication strategy, to avoid replication, contribute to current programs and identify any knowledge gaps.\(^{157}\)
- **Participatory exploratory research** with target audiences and stakeholders. For example, when it became apparent there was not an existing evidence-base for people who identify as LGBTIQ, stakeholder engagement was initiated with 50 people who identify as LGBTIQ.
- **Utilising evaluation research** from early waves of the campaigns to both measure the impact of the campaign but also importantly provide guidance for subsequent phases.

The campaigns drew on a strong evidence-base to inform their design, as shown in Table G.2.

Table G.2 Examples of evidence to inform communication initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>Examples of evidence base used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Stop the Hurting</td>
<td>• World Health Organisation Violence Prevention briefing&lt;br&gt;• Reducing violence against women and their children research(^{158})&lt;br&gt;• Co-design and focus group engagement&lt;br&gt;• Engaging young people in regional, rural and remote Australia(^{159})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Abuse</td>
<td>• Accessed helpline data collected by UnitingCare Community Elder Abuse Prevention Unit, Brisbane Seniors Legal and the Public Trustee&lt;br&gt;• Reviewed learnings from prior variations of elder abuse campaigns and engagement with the Elder Abuse Prevention Helpline&lt;br&gt;• Literature reviewed as a part of the Elder Abuse Prevention Unit Year in Review reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander</td>
<td>• Primary research conducted with Queensland Community&lt;br&gt;• Additional academic literature review and industry benchmark conducted by advertising agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Primary research with target audiences was an important design component that led to significant design impacts across several initiatives, ultimately improving the campaign development and delivery to ensure appropriateness. For example, in review of the Bystander campaign, early research highlighted that the target audience was not yet ready for the high-level messages originally developed. A decision was made to adapt the original messages to focus on awareness and knowledge improvements, as the first step in long-term behaviour change. This decision had impacts on the creative development of concepts and messaging used to better align the Bystander campaign with the current context among the Queensland community. Further, LGBTIQ consultation highlighted the need to deliver an authentic voice through trusted sources. This led specifically into a campaign design that focused not on traditional media and channels, but innovative approaches taken such as media partnerships with Facebook groups (i.e. Queer without Fear), and social influencers on Instagram and YouTube. In addition, testing of concepts and early measurement of progress of campaigns assisted in obtaining necessary support for refinement, if required, and accommodation of timeline changes.

While a substantial amount of foundational research evidence was used to inform the design of campaigns, there were instances, particularly for some of the general audience campaigns, where further evidence could have been drawn from primary research to ensure the evidence-based used was applicable and relevant to the Queensland audience. Evidence inputs (literature, prior campaign learnings and especially primary research including concept testing) need to be comprehensive and iterative. If the inputs are not appropriate for the audience and the goal of the communication initiatives, then effectiveness is limited.

Corporate knowledge was both an enabler, and lack of, or loss of, corporate knowledge was a barrier. Built up over time from the ‘Not Now, Not Ever Report’, stakeholders perceived this corporate knowledge as an asset to be optimised for future campaigns. This corporate knowledge existed internally and with market research suppliers and creative agencies because of the incremental discovery journey over time. However, in some circumstances, there were challenges with losses of corporate knowledge when internal structural changes, portfolio changes during machinery of government changes meant that not only staff, but also the information systems and storage of knowledge move from one department or section to another. This meant that new implementation agency staff had to invest time with key stakeholders or subject matter experts to ensure the design of the campaigns was appropriate, and created a risk of replicating campaigns. Ensuring processes are in place to manage the retention of corporate knowledge in times of transition can increase the efficiencies and consistencies of campaign design.

Further, stakeholders noted improvement opportunities related to collating information into a central repository for learning, particularly with legislative changes, federal policies and general research either locally (i.e. ANROWS etc.) or globally. This would facilitate sharing information and learnings that could be readily accessed to inform communications strategies and campaigns. This may also assist in overcoming barriers associated with loss of corporate knowledge.

Another barrier in the design process was that creative agencies needed to develop an understanding about domestic and family violence, in order to understand all the evidence and inputs. There were few creative agencies with experience or expertise in creating campaigns for this complex issue with sensitive messaging. As a result, during implementation, campaign owners took responsibility for appropriate briefing and immersion of the creative agency in supporting material. This included DPC training the creative agencies in domestic and family violence by drawing on their own corporate knowledge. Having an understanding about domestic and family violence is crucial for the design of campaign messages. It is therefore important in future planning, to ensure that time and resources
are allocated for training and development where there may be gaps in knowledge among creative agencies.

Limited data also impeded the extent of targeting that could occur, particularly for certain campaigns. For example limited data on the prevalence of elder abuse meant it was unclear where to target the campaign geographically and who the campaigns should be targeting – older people themselves, their adult children or adult grandchildren. Literature shows that financial and psychological abuse are the most common forms of elder abuse among older Queenslanders,\textsuperscript{160} however stakeholders stated that there was no prevalent data on knowledge and awareness of the behaviour which constitutes elder abuse, to inform the target and focus of campaigns. Acknowledging the challenges associated with collecting data on domestic and family violence (such as reliance on reporting), this nonetheless has flow-on implications for the specificity of the campaigns. In future, this could in part be overcome through better access to existing data sets to better inform campaigns (i.e. prevalence of Elder Abuse from QPS or QWIC datasets in specific geographic areas or target audiences).

Stakeholders also noted opportunities to improve linkages between the various engagement and communications initiatives to ensure a progressive storyline and consistent messaging flows between campaigns. These linkages could also extend to Queensland initiatives and the National Action Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children. For example, communications work could complement work already undertaken by the Commonwealth Government and Council of Australia Governments, such as The Stop It at The Start campaign, which helped to break the cycle of violence by encouraging adults to reflect on their attitudes and to have conversations about respect with young people.

\textbf{G.6.2 Development}

Features of developing the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy that worked well included the \textit{mix of agencies and organisations} involved, \textit{processes used to develop advertising and creative material} and \textit{user concept testing}.

For the development of individual creative activities and planning, the DPC and other implementing agencies utilised a \textbf{mix of agencies and organisations} which appeared to work well. This included external advertising agencies, in-house creative teams, MediaCom for media scheduling and buying, and occasionally the use of external creative teams (especially in the instance of advertising or social content). This mixture of internal and external skills and expenditure was appropriate for the mix of campaigns and in accordance with the budget provisioned for delivery. For example, mass media campaigns utilised external advertising agencies while smaller components of the campaigns were developed in-house.

Specific processes undertaken to develop \textit{advertising and creative materials} helped to achieve the intended purpose. This included:

\begin{itemize}
\item Detailed campaign proposals, final creative materials, and a campaign evaluation for each campaign.
\item Formal advertising strategy documentation from external advertising agencies outlining the intent of the campaign, inputs into campaign development, resulting justification for the creative direction to be taken and the campaign concepts. DPC undertook a formal review and approval process in each instance.
\item Major campaigns including Youth Stop the Hurting, Bystander and LGBTIQ undertook formal concept testing in the form of multiple focus groups with the target audiences to sense check and hone concepts prior to full development.
\item Co-design with the target audience (i.e. Youth) to develop an appropriate approach, tone and messaging. Stakeholders received positive feedback from those involved in the process that it was an appropriate conversation to have with these target audiences directly to help them shape the narrative.
\end{itemize}

Where budget limited the ability to engage directly with the primary audience of the campaign, there was evidence of engagement with other relevant stakeholders. This included expert consortium for Bystander, Public Service Commission, the Queensland LGBTI Roundtable, the Elder Abuse Prevention Unit, sector reference group relevant to the Elder Abuse Prevention Campaign, Queensland Police Service, and Law Society.

Appropriate consultations with impacted stakeholders and organisations during the development also helped to ensure that the campaigns would work with their activities and timelines. An example of this was DPC contacting Kids Helpline and DVConnect before and during the Help-seeking campaigns focused around December – February, to ensure that call volumes were not being driven beyond capacity.

In some instances, campaigns were developed with less reliance on development and testing with the primary target audience. For example, while the No Excuse for Elder Abuse had been run previously, the new phase of the campaign in development, Elder Abuse Prevention, deviates in the message and creative design, with limited additional development and testing inputs on whether it is appropriate for the target audience beyond consultation with stakeholders.

Learnings and challenges identified by stakeholders which occurred during the development process included:

- General campaigns may have visual representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people from CALD backgrounds or other vulnerable population groups in the context, talent placement or message; but there is uncertainty from some stakeholders and creative owners about whether it is culturally appropriate.
- Budgets being disproportionately allocated to spending on additional media rather than investing in better creative development and concept testing to ensure the messaging cuts through and hits the mark with target audiences. Hence, in hindsight, budgets do not allow for specific testing of mainstream messages with diverse audiences to check they are applicable or for potentially adverse effects.

G.6.3 Delivery

Once campaigns were developed and approved the delivery to market was generally successful, supported by a number of enablers identified by stakeholders. One such enabler was the high priority given to the communications by the Queensland Government. As such, the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy initiatives had significant profile across government. This ownership at senior levels within implementation agencies facilitated cross agency collaboration and enabled and encouraged innovative methods of engagement, co-design and delivery.

Consistent use of a preferred media buying agency also assisted delivery of campaigns. MediaCom was identified by implementing agencies as a valuable resource in the delivery of the campaigns to ensure that the right channel was selected for the right audience. They provided substantial strategy documentation, worked within budgets available, provided post-evaluation documentation and provided recommendations for subsequent campaigns. This was very important to assess side by side against other post-evaluation inputs and will assist with ongoing channel selection and return on investment (ROI).

One mechanism that worked well for delivery was leveraging partnerships to offer opportunities for high exposure and reach. The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy stresses the role of community, workplaces and schools play in changing the culture and attitudes that underpin violence in our community. Support from the community service sector and partnerships with organisations helped to increase the reach and appeal of communications. Importantly, it showed that advocacy for domestic and family violence prevention is from trusted voices, organisations and peers rather than solely government messaging. A number of official partners have engaged in activities for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month including Queensland Rail, Gold Coast Suns, Brisbane Lions, Queensland Police, Brisbane City Council and the Heritage Bank. The Gold Coast Suns, official partners for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, decided for one game to not run through their opening match banner which
advertised prevention of domestic and family violence, because they felt that the message was so important that they wanted to maximise onscreen exposure.

Challenges in delivery arose due to the complexity of the many components of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy and multiple stakeholders required to collaborate across Departments. Where these challenges were overcome this was the result of information sharing, collaboration and project management to harness the efforts of all parties.

Further, although some campaigns were intended to be supportive campaigns based around high incident periods, it appears that greater consideration may be required to the sequencing of executions around the same time. While multiple domestic and family violence messages may assist in building visibility and consistency in the overall message from the Queensland Government, stakeholders were concerned it might lead to audience confusion and fatigue (noting it is uncertain whether or not this has actually occurred). Coordination of Domestic and Family Violence communication scheduling could assist in ensuring that future campaigns and initiatives do not confuse, override each other or fatigue Queenslanders to the important message.

Stakeholders interviewed felt that increased visibility of what others were doing might have helped inform their own initiatives (i.e. having an understanding of different campaigns in play to avoid clashes in media programming for different campaigns). There was an expressed need to have more understanding of when communications initiatives and engagement initiatives was going into market across the various implementing agencies.

Some stakeholders felt that the sector capacity needed strengthening first, particularly where targeting diverse population groups with communications. This reflects service sector readiness to cope with any potential influx of diverse population groups to frontline services as a result of communications. Specifically, that increased awareness and help seeking behaviour could not be met with an appropriate response if the sector were not adequately trained and resourced to service clients with specific needs. This approach was adopted in New South Wales, which is initially focused on strengthening the frontline service delivery and sector response systems. They viewed the Commonwealth as the overarching messenger for mainstream messaging and focussed only on ground up engagement initiatives offering communities an opportunity to apply to their Innovation Fund Grants. These grants resulted in a range of activities, with only a few targeted communications activities and majority with more specific behaviour change programs working with specific target groups. It is important that the messages and communications are tailored to the Queensland audience, and a need to ensure service sectors are equipped and ready to manage any implications from effective communications campaigns, such as increased demand for their services arising from more help-seeking behaviour.

Other challenges raised by stakeholders during the delivery phase included:

- Campaign owners are not always able to undertake specific post-evaluation research due to budget restrictions. This impacts upon their ability to understand if they are making a difference and other more subjective feedback often is the only evidence of impact.
- Concerns over the capability and the capacity of the service sector to respond to an increase of awareness, help seeking and response from effective campaigns. It is important for campaign owners to understand the sector-readiness in the reform to ensure communications efforts drive action that can be supported by front line services and agencies. There was demonstration of where this has been done effectively in instances such as the Summer Help Seeking campaign where call service call volumes were monitored for overload. This sort of sector-readiness planning can assist in overcoming challenges in being able to meet demand for services and working appropriately with service providers to manage campaign impacts.
- Election periods were identified as an obstacle for the roll out of the communication initiatives and contributed to slowing down progress for procurement. However, the bi-partisan support assisted in ensuring that some momentum was maintained. There is little that can be done to avoid these impacts beyond allowing for flexibility and the ability to maintain momentum through bi-partisan support.
• Queensland Government approvals processes take time and this needs to be appropriately managed by campaign owners to work with the approvals timelines in planning campaign roll out.

G.6.4 Specific initiatives
There were a number of aspects that worked well, along with improvement opportunities, for particular initiatives within the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, including the media guide, videos and grants.

A core activity was the development and roll out of a media guide, launched to industry in October 2017. The media guide was a document rolled out to primarily media outlets and journalists. This document contained a guide for the appropriate approach to journalism and media reporting on domestic and family violence, aligned with the broader Queensland Government Strategy. DPC subsequently engaged consultancy agency Phillips Group to establish a communication plan to improve awareness and use of the Media Guide. The Communication Plan was developed in December 2018 and included a set of 33 communication activities that could be undertaken to maximise take up. No additional funds were allocated to embedding the guide and the project has not been actively pursued.

Stakeholders consider that while the media guide and the surrounding engagement was useful, additional improvements could have been realised with budget availability. For example, the development of case studies of domestic and family violence victim survivors and their encounters could provide examples of an appropriate media and journalist reporting approach.

Dedicated budget and resources would also be required to implement the Phillips Group recommendations to engage and further embed this guide within Queensland media.

The implementing agencies felt that the process of running the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Grants was efficient and streamlined through online software tools. Stakeholder consultations demonstrated that awareness of the grants is high among organisations. To ensure equitable access to the grants across Queensland, time is allocated to assessing the applications based on an appropriate mix of geography, diversity and prioritisation of vulnerable population groups to cover a range of community groups throughout Queensland.

Stakeholders interviewed felt that when the grants were themed (i.e. ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ launch, Bystander Launch) they received a better response from applicants, due to better direction guiding the applications. This was apparent reviewing the successful applications. Theming the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month Grants is also considered to gain more traction with applicants as the theme penetrates multiple channels, increasing the exposure of the major campaign messages. When there is no theme or the theme is not known or communicated in time for the release of the grants, interviewees felt there was less innovative or creative grants.

Finally, the “Take up the challenge to end Domestic and Family Violence” ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ website video series is a good example of how much communities have engaged with sharing their stories and showcasing their strategies to change behaviour from the ground up using their voices, tone, and culture to produce messages that resonate with their communities. Community groups have uploaded over 55 video submissions. Stakeholders felt that the messages were more likely to be trusted and understood when delivered from community organisations and service providers rather than from Government particularly for target audiences like youth, CALD and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

G.7 Research question three: How have the communication initiatives been effectively tailored to meet the needs of diverse population groups

The Second Action Plan identified actions concerned with the development of a communication and engagement strategy aimed at impacting the attitudes and beliefs of the Queensland community including campaigns to be specifically aimed at youths, people who identify as LGBTIQ and elder abuse. A combination of targeted population messaging, and a broader Queensland wide campaign audience, assisted in taking the central key messages for influencing attitudes and beliefs, and ensuring they are relevant and able to be ‘heard’ by the targeted populations.
Consultations and co-design
The DPC and other campaign owners ensured appropriate incorporation of most target populations in the design and development stages of the campaigns to tailor messages and better engage with audiences. For example, the LGBTIQ campaign was informed by a community consultation process to capture relationship insights from more than 50 people who identify as LGBTIQ.

The co-design approach for the design of the Youth Stop the Hurting campaign ensured that the campaign resonated well with the target audience with 80% of teenagers who saw the campaign saying they understood the ad messages and that messages were important. Other co-design elements such as youth workshops and creative design competitions with Illy (an Australian hip hop artist) also achieved resonance with teenagers.

All campaign owners strongly perceived that this level of engagement with their target audience significantly influenced a positive outcome for the campaign with their intended audience (and anticipate it to be so for the LGBTIQ campaign).

Channels of delivery
The mix of formats and media strategy used has benefited the overall strategy, in particular reaching diverse population groups. Queensland wide, mass campaigns such as Bystander identified that TV channels were most successful. However, youth audiences were more likely be exposed to campaigns such as Bystander and the Youth Stop the Hurting campaigns via digital and social media. Conversely, older audiences remained more likely to recall the campaigns via TV, print and radio. This deliberate coverage of traditional and emerging media channels has maximised the success of the overall reach of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, and represents an effective means of reaching populations.

The tailored approach to messaging worked successfully in conveying the agreed upon central key messages regarding domestic and family violence to a diverse audience. Working with media partners and media buyers, the channel selection and placement strategy was also a fundamental factor in successfully ensuring the right messages reached the right audiences. For niche or hard to reach target audiences (i.e. LGBTIQ or Youth) it was important to seek out their expertise on what would work best. This demonstrates the importance of listening to the target audience, and adopting the media channels most likely to be used by them.

Consistent yet tailored messages
Despite the different target audiences and need for different approaches, common key messages fundamental to the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy were generally maintained across all for campaigns. In this way, there is a cumulative effect in campaign message delivery.

At this stage of the communication strategy there have been steps taken to effectively tailor messages to a diverse population. For example, a core campaign message was ‘domestic and family violence is unacceptable’. The Youth Stop the Hurting campaign website included the message ‘no matter who, it’s wrong’, while the elder abuse tagline included ‘there’s no excuse for elder abuse’. These show how the core message has been appropriately tailored to the respective target audiences while maintaining its original intent.

Budget constraints
Limited budgets have imposed a limit to how much the campaign messages can be tailored to secondary target audiences or sub-sets i.e. the diversity within primary target audience groups. Tailoring the design of a campaign to sub-sets of target audiences consumes additional time and resources - to ensure that campaign materials are appropriate and reflect various segments of the target population into images, video and social media assets to make the central campaign messages more relevant to a variety of audiences. Stakeholder consultations demonstrated that the current funding levels were insufficient to tailor all materials appropriately, to the extent they desired. For example, the pending Elder Abuse Prevention campaign and Youth Stop the Hurting campaign use a varied range of imagery to assist in achieving this increased relevance. There have also been steps to provide translated materials in some campaigns such as No Excuse for Elder Abuse.
There remains work in future campaign strategies to further talk in an appropriate manner to diversified sub-sets within primary target audience groups. For example, there remains clear recognition from DPC and stakeholders that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and people from CALD backgrounds need to be targeted. To do so will require further community action research and collaboration with subject matter experts and key stakeholders to ensure a ground up approach to informing the campaigns, all of which consumes additional resources.

G.8 Research question four: How effective has the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy, including the communications campaigns as a collective, been?

Overall, the focus of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy to date has been on awareness and attitudes, to lay a foundational level of knowledge and understanding of domestic and family violence across the Queensland community. Evidence to date on effectiveness includes:

- **Exposure to campaign materials are influencing individual level capacity and confidence** – campaigns which conducted formal post-evaluations (example: Youth and Bystander) identified that those who recalled the campaign felt more comfortable undertaking a range of actions, were more likely to know where to seek help and were more personally confident in potentially taking action.

- **The campaigns (example: Youth and Bystander) are facilitating dialogue and discussions of the issue of domestic and family violence among the community** – much of the direct action being taken as a result of seeing the campaigns by those who could recall the campaigns relates to more general information seeking and discussion among family, friends and peers. This increased level of dialogue and engagement, even if related to discussing the campaign creative or topic, is a positive outcome in increasing awareness and knowledge of domestic and family violence even if the discussion is not specifically with victim survivors and perpetrators.

- **Queenslanders support the Queensland Government’s work to increase awareness and knowledge of domestic and family violence through communication and engagement activities** – the post-evaluation for both the Queensland wide Bystander campaign and the targeted Youth Stop the Hurting campaigns measured the perceived importance of each campaign. An overwhelming majority of responses expressed that people, once they saw the ads, felt the advertising had an important role in raising awareness of the complex issue of domestic and family violence (94% and 80% total agreement noted for the Bystander campaign and Youth Stop the Hurting campaign Phase 1 respectively). It is important for the source of the message to be trusted, as this contributes to buy-in and ultimately, effectiveness.

The post-evaluation evidence available on the campaigns highlighted some key drivers supporting successful outcomes:

- **Multiple phases of campaign evolution will maximise the impact of the entire campaign strategy** – as evidenced by the Youth Stop the Hurting campaigns Phases 1 & 2 there is significant benefit in a long-term strategy to evolving campaign messaging and creative. In Phase 2, despite significantly lower media spend, recall remained quite high and young people were still recalling imagery and ads from the initial Phase 1. Stakeholders suggested that the overarching campaign executions are therefore memorable for this target audience however there were also concerns raised about whether future campaigns would need a refresh of creative elements (i.e. some visual assets, colours or even clothes) to activate attention and avoid potential for message fatigue. It also allows messaging to become more sophisticated once initial messages directed at influencing awareness, knowledge and attitudes are widely accepted.

- **The extension and evolution of a successful campaign concept via using a central message over multiple phases of a campaign allows for the campaign to have longevity and build upon early awareness of the central concept, and over time influence attitudes and behaviour.** The success of the federal government’s Let’s Stop it at the Start which has run since 2016 is a national example in the domestic and family violence context where the campaign builds over time supported by multiple waves.
• **Strategic campaign targeting and media selection has provided more efficient means of distributing messages** – some of the less expensive campaign elements, such as social media advertising, have been an efficient method of reaching a wide audience. Social media can be an advertising method that can be delivered at a lower cost compared to other methods, such as television media campaigns, but can still reach a wide audience. This suggests that the overall Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy has been well thought out and planned, to be able to leverage an impact from the less expensive campaign elements. Examples of such campaigns include Youth Stop the Hurting Phase 2 and the Help-seeking campaign.

• **DPC continues to learn about domestic and family violence and evolve actions in an appropriate manner** – continuous learning is essential to the success of a long-term communication strategy, especially one tackling such a complex issue as domestic and family violence. Throughout the design, development and delivery of all campaigns under the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy there is evidence of the Queensland Government’s desire to understand the issue at hand, note achievements as well as areas that require further attention and to include all learnings into the design, development and delivery of future components of the campaigns. Implementing agencies feel that the in-house knowledge of this complex issue has increased significantly and is now enabling better campaigns.

• **Using the evidence-base** – within Australian and international literature there is a substantial body of work which exists on tackling domestic and family violence. A comprehensive literature review enabled campaign owners and creative agencies, in combination with consultations with experts on domestic and family violence, to approach the design and implementation of campaigns with a strong evidence-base. However, it was also recognised that the Queensland population may have a differing set of societal norms, existing knowledge and varying avenues for seeking help that may differ from other evidence from within domestic and international literature. Formal primary research and informal community consultation opportunities were taken by DPC on a regular basis to understand the dialogue and awareness and attitudes towards domestic and family violence within Queensland. This included formal market research with Queenslanders and varying target audiences and co-design components with challenging audiences such as youth. These actions taken to understand the domestic and family violence situation and conversation have resulted in fundamental changes to early ideas relating to campaign strategy and led to more appropriate tailoring of messages.

### G.8.1 Awareness and knowledge

The communication campaigns collectively have assisted in consolidating and maintaining awareness levels of domestic and family violence among Queenslanders and the varying target audiences. Reach and recall are commonly used measurement metrics to understand the extent to which campaigns achieve exposure amongst their audience. While there is limited evaluation reach data for some campaigns, particular reach highlights include:

- Placement of the Bystander campaign during State of Origin coverage
- 2.5 million unique digital users reached by the Bystander campaign alone
- All campaign microsites collectively generated over 310,000 unique visitors to End Domestic and Family Violence websites for domestic and family violence campaigns
- Over 500 media items addressing the Bystander campaign and White Ribbon Breakfasts in the time periods surrounding campaign activity.

The ability of the collective campaigns to achieve awareness and recall among Queenslanders was notably high. For example, the Bystander and Youth Stop the Hurting Phase 1 achieved prompt recall of campaign materials of 58% and 83% respectively and these levels of recall are notably high in contrast to industry benchmarks.\(^\text{161}\) The use of digital channels was also successful in achieving exposure. For example, the Help-seeking campaign in 2016-2017 achieving a reach of 2,511 people per day in a targeted manner beyond the expectations of reaching 1,700 people per day (with a $3,000 budget). The second phase of the Help-seeking campaign in 2017-2018 achieved click

\(^{161}\) Ipsos research industry benchmarks based on TV reach and TARP ratios.
through rates of 12%, well above commercial industry standards of around 2%.$^{162}$ This relative low-cost Help seeking campaign investment achieved beyond average click rate standards. The White Ribbon video was used on the Queensland Government Facebook page in December 2018 and as of mid-January 2019 had reached more than 12,000 people organically compared to average reach per posts for December 2018 being 2,567.$^{163}$

The post-evaluation results of each campaign suggests that sub-segments of the population are increasing their knowledge and this should ultimately translate into a broader increase in awareness and knowledge. Although this increase among those who have seen the campaign has not yet translated into societal changes in levels of awareness and knowledge as measured in the Queensland Social Survey.

DPC’s strategy of using campaigns to focus on building awareness, support, engagement and understanding during latter 2017 and into 2018 has been appropriate as the first crucial stage of developing sustained behaviour change for Queenslanders.

### G.8.2 Attitudes, perceptions and confidence regarding behaviour

Along with increases in awareness and knowledge there have been positive impacts upon Queenslander’s attitudes and intent as a direct outcome of communication campaigns and activities.

Again, although the Queensland Social Survey 2018 showed no statistically significant shifts in Queenslanders' attitudes towards domestic and family violence, the underlying campaign post-evaluations did show that to an extent the campaigns are influencing attitudes and intent. For instance, once individuals view the Bystander campaign TV advertisement, 67% agreed they were ‘more aware of my role in preventing domestic and family violence’.

There is evidence that the campaigns improved levels of confidence in ability to intervene appropriately and comfort in doing so. Evidence of this was the significant increase in attitudes among Queenslanders in agreeing ‘I would be confident that I would be able to offer the right kind of help to someone experiencing domestic and family violence’ from 48% in 2017 to 59% agreement in 2018 among those who recalled the Bystander campaign. In addition, 57% of those who recalled the Bystander campaign agreed ‘I have a stronger intention to intervene in a domestic and family violence incident’. Particular target audiences, such as youth, are also positive in their attitude and intent as a result of seeing the Youth Stop the Hurting campaigns with over 90% of youth who recalled the campaign indicating they would feel comfortable taking some action after having seen the campaign and 78% feeling better informed about how to seek help.

### G.8.3 Future directions

It was apparent quite early on in the application of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy that Queenslanders were still in the early days of their understanding the issue of domestic and family violence. This led to refining the focus of the messages in the communication campaigns to build awareness and knowledge of domestic and family violence first before introducing more complex concepts. From a theoretical behaviour change perspective it will be important to build some greater sophistication into future campaign messaging to push Queenslanders into areas of perception that challenge their status quo of behaviour.

Stakeholders consider that the messages need to be consistent over the longer term while slowly introducing in a considered manner, new layers of the domestic and family violence messaging building on existing campaigns. Prior to building these more complex messages into the campaigns, stakeholders felt there was still more work to be done with existing campaign platforms and current messaging. This would ensure a consistent and solid foundation which could be built upon with more sophisticated messages over time.

---

$^{162}$ Commercial industry standards from MediaCom.

$^{163}$ Queensland Government Facebook Page statistics as supplied by the DPC.
Some hard to reach target markets are still not always well understood and would benefit from more research and co-design through community led initiatives. That is, community designed and owned messages are likely to be more effective and appropriate than a top-down government approach.

The measurement of impact is also challenging to interpret at this early stage. For example, progress may be observed in individual campaign post-evaluation research, however it will be important to monitor whether, over time, this contributes (alongside other initiatives under the domestic and family violence reforms), to population-level outcomes on awareness measured through the QSS. This case study relies on the post-campaign evaluations to determine effectiveness. There is also a challenge in understanding where emphasis on varying statistics should be placed – whether the emphasis should be placed on using self-reported responses to influences on behaviour, or non-direct measurement of shifts in attitude and behaviour over time, or wider actual statistics on domestic and family violence, service access and judicial processes. Finally, not all campaigns have primary research evaluating impact on the target audience and when formal evaluation statistics are reported they vary significantly across the campaign suite. Some campaigns are well measured for impact, while others lack any quantifiable measurement, making an assessment of the performance of all campaigns across the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy not easy to consistently provide evidence for.

The reality of behaviour change progress is often somewhere in between all of the available statistics and all must be looked at holistically and over time to determine progress. However, building in greater consistency in measurement of impact at all levels (attitude, knowledge, intent, behaviour and societal values) will assist in seeing a clearer picture of where future communication activities are having an impact. Stakeholders and this case study support amendments to the Queensland Social Survey to align measures more specifically with the communication’s program logic to assist with measurement.

There is further opportunity to collaborate and convey learnings across government departments and teams tasked at addressing the supporting outcome of Queenslanders taking a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence. Further centralisation of information sources, cross-referencing and collaboration could further improve internal knowledge and capability.

G.9 Conclusion

The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy has been implemented in an effective manner. Government agencies have delivered all major campaign and engagement initiatives intended by the strategy. The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy was designed to be a high level planning document, intended to be flexible and agile as communication and engagement initiatives progressed. Minor deviations from the original strategy were appropriate and considered against new and emerging evidence bases, collaboration with target audiences and sectors, evaluation outcomes of early initiatives and to more appropriately guide development and delivery of all elements.

The delivery of three years of communication and engagement initiatives within the broader context of a 10 year plan has achieved an increase in capacity and confidence of individuals and increased dialogue on the issue of domestic and family violence. This has set the foundation for the Queensland Government to increase sophistication of messages related to domestic and family violence.

Key learnings relate to success factors of using strong evidence bases in formulation of strategy and material development, leverage of the incremental learnings achieved over time, drawing upon external expertise and community feedback as required to deliver strong communication campaigns and the high priority given to the implementation of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy.

Future opportunities include:

- Continuing to draw on, wherever possible, primary data collection to ensure communications and engagement materials are appropriate to the Queensland and target audience
- Increasing access to existing data to closely understand the intended audience to facilitate a more targeted campaign
• Ensuring service-system readiness to respond to any consequences of communications and engagement activities
• Pooling of information to assist in overcoming barriers associated with loss of corporate knowledge
• Creating linkages and alignment with any communications under the Fourth National Action Plan
• Conducting research and co-design through community led initiatives in target markets
• Building on existing campaign platforms to fully set the groundwork for more complex messaging and targeting, to increase sophistication of messages to push behaviour change in these areas

Many of these opportunities focus on the design phase and supporting resources that facilitates an effective communications and engagement strategy.
Appendix H: Mackay Taskforce and Regional Council case study

H.1 Overview of the case study
This case study focuses on learnings from the Mackay Regional Council to encourage local community and business ownership of the domestic and family violence reforms. This recognises the work undertaken by the Mackay Regional Council, led by Mayor Greg Williamson, including several initiatives to address domestic and family violence in the local community, including the establishment of a local Domestic Violence Taskforce (hereby referred to as the Mackay Taskforce).

The scope of this case study is aligned with supporting outcome three in the Second Action Plan:

To what extent do Queensland community, business, religious, sporting and all government leaders take action and work together?

H.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following a consultation with the DPC and Mackay Regional Council. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Outcome question three**: To what extent do Queensland community, business, religious, sporting and all government leaders take action and work together?

The overarching research questions take into consideration the stage of the project. The key questions include:

1. What works to engage communities, including businesses, to contribute to the domestic and family violence reforms?
2. How can the domestic and family violence reforms be placed on local community agendas, and sustained over time?
3. How can local government, businesses and the service sector collaborate to address domestic and family violence?
4. What barriers and enablers are there to engaging local communities, including businesses, in taking ownership of the domestic and family violence reforms?

H.3 Data sources
The following primary and secondary data sources were used to inform this case study:

- one 90-minute focus group with Mackay Regional Council
- one focus group and two semi-structured interviews of up to 60 minutes each with members of the Mackay Taskforce representing the business community, including representatives from Bank of Queensland, Mackay Sugar, Dalrymple Bay Coal Terminal (DCBT) and Minds Aligned
- one semi-structured interview of 60 minutes with members of the Mackay Taskforce representing the domestic and family violence service sector, including representatives from Mackay Women’s Centre and Central Queensland University’s Domestic Violence Research Centre
- Mackay Regional Council – Five marketing materials for Mackay Draws The Line campaign
- Mackay Regional Council – ‘White Ribbon Accreditation project plan’
Mackay Regional Council – ‘Contact details of Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce members’

H.4 Background to the Domestic Violence Taskforce in Mackay

Following a visit from Quentin Bryce in October 2016, the Mackay Regional Council embarked on internal and community-facing initiatives to address domestic and family violence in its community.

Internal-facing activities included the Council providing domestic and family violence prevention training to its staff, implementing domestic and family violence workplace policies including leave\textsuperscript{164}, and embarking on White Ribbon Accreditation (WRA).

The Mackay Regional Council established the Mackay Domestic Violence Taskforce (the Mackay Taskforce) to facilitate community collaboration and discussion to prevent and address domestic and family violence in the community. Founded by the Mackay Regional Council in November 2016 and chaired by current Mayor Greg Williamson, the Mackay Taskforce’s mission is:

“To provide the influence, the skills and support to create a community in which respect and equality prevails and families can live in safety”\textsuperscript{165}.

The Mackay Taskforce consists of representatives from a variety of local community groups including businesses, the media, schools and universities, police services, and specialist domestic and family violence service providers. Over the past two years since its inception, the Mackay Taskforce has met five times (approximately six-monthly). With the Mayor as the chair, the Mackay Taskforce aims to create a ‘strategic think tank’\textsuperscript{165} for discussion and sharing of ideas among community groups, as well as helping people ‘connect the dots’\textsuperscript{166} on the topic of domestic and family violence prevention.

The Mackay Taskforce has been involved in, and responsible for, a wide range of activities in the Mackay community, including the ‘Draws The Line’ campaign and an upcoming ‘sticker’ campaign. The latter involves designing and distributing rubbish bin stickers that aim to raise awareness of domestic and family violence.

H.5 Research question one: What works to engage communities, including businesses, to contribute to the domestic and family violence reforms?

Stakeholders identified several mechanisms that worked well to encourage them, and others, to become engaged in contributing to domestic and family violence reforms.

Recognised leaders raising the profile of domestic and family violence, and encouraging others to become involved in the response, was a consistent theme stakeholders raised for engaging in the reforms. The Mackay Regional Council noted that visits by Quentin Bryce and Rosie Batty helped to raise the profile of domestic and family violence, and compelled it, as a local council, to respond. For other community-based organisations including businesses, the Mayor’s invitation to join the Mackay Taskforce prompted their involvement. Some stakeholders suggested having a male community leader and an elected official may have contributed to encouraging business and broader community engagement in the Mackay Taskforce. The commentary highlighted the usefulness of leadership from both female and male figures to promote the concept of gender equality in progressing responses toward domestic and family violence. This is an example of the important role leaders play in raising awareness and facilitating engagement.

The development of the Mackay Taskforce itself was also a way for the local government to engage community through open dialogue. The Mackay Taskforce created a forum to discuss how individuals and organisations could address domestic and family violence and provided a centralised mechanism for engagement and sharing of ideas. Stakeholders commented that the time commitment (Two to three-hour meetings approximately twice per year) was appropriate to

\textsuperscript{164} According to Queensland Government – Office of Industrial Relations, ‘a long-term casual employee is entitled to a maximum of 10 days unpaid domestic and family violence leave per year. A short-term casual employee is entitled to a maximum of two days unpaid domestic and family violence leave per year’.


\textsuperscript{166} As referred to by stakeholders from Mackay Regional Council during consultation.
maintain engagement. Although not a traditional role of the local government, stakeholders commented that Mackay Regional Council has taken ownership of the Mackay Taskforce in recognition that it will positively contribute to community safety. While its establishment was considered an important mechanism for engaging the community, the Mackay Taskforce has relied on relationships developed and members’ willingness to learn to ensure its sustainability.

Several stakeholders also noted the importance of leading by example as a way to encourage involvement. Stakeholders reflected that not only did the Mackay Regional Council play a role in facilitating the Mackay Taskforce, but they also demonstrated they were responding to domestic and family violence through their own internal initiatives, including domestic and family violence leave policies and WRA. This ‘leading by doing’ contributed to setting the example for others. Similarly, other stakeholders noted the State Government also encourages engagement by modelling the behaviours it wishes to see others adopt.

Providing localised data and information to make domestic and family violence personally and professionally relevant to members of the Mackay Taskforce was another tactic used as a call to action to engage organisations in responding to domestic and family violence, by exposing the extent of the problem in the community. Of note, while some members were engaged in the Mackay Taskforce due to a self-awareness of the issue, others were involved by invitation and, through their participation, gained a greater awareness of the domestic and family violence issue in their local area. To give an example of localised information shared, stakeholders noted that when local first responders and service providers spoke about rates of domestic and family violence in the Mackay region, it reinforced why it needed to be addressed in and by the community. An example of information shared with the business community included165,167 that ‘the Magistrate in Mackay runs a separate Court every Friday to deal with domestic and family violence matters of which 60-80 cases are heard each Friday’. Stakeholders also raised that having a personal connection or story within their business or community helped to raise the profile as to why they felt compelled to become engaged in the response.

Businesses also identified that at its core, engagement in domestic and family violence reforms was about the business case for them and their duty of care to employees. Recognising there is an economic and employee wellbeing imperative to do so. One organisation explained that for this reason it is important businesses have access to data that shows the impact of domestic and family violence on businesses and the community to establish the ‘business case’. In fact, this recognition has also enabled businesses to be more cognisant of how important and prevalent the issue is among their employee base and what responses are suitable. Examples of responses from the business community include linking responding to domestic and family violence to broader employment policies, such as mental health and wellbeing, or providing alternative housing for perpetrators to keep victims safe at home.

For smaller businesses, it was noted it can be more challenging for them to become engaged in responding to domestic and family violence due to limited resources. One mechanism to overcome this barrier was engagement through industry bodies, such as the Chamber of Commerce or the Resource Industry Network. In this way, they are able to have access to information and potentially resources through industry groups to support their implementation process of domestic and family violence policies in the workplace.

H.6 Research question two: How can the domestic and family violence reforms be placed on local community agendas, and sustained over time?

Local leaders championing the cause and drawing on localised data raised awareness of domestic and family violence in the community and encouraged people to respond. Stakeholders also commented on the importance of having a regular forum to continue the discussion of domestic and family violence, and share ideas. In the case of Mackay, this is reflected in the role of the Mackay Taskforce, which was organised and facilitated by the Mackay Regional Council. They noted the time

commitment for this was appropriate. By bringing everyone together in a regular forum, it allows participants to pool ideas, and work together to reinforce and progress change.

Some stakeholders also highlighted the importance of continued outputs, in addition to open discussion, in building and sustaining the commitment over time. Several people identified that the upcoming ‘sticker campaign’ that will be placed on rubbish bins is a visible way of showing the commitment to continue raising awareness of domestic and family violence in the community.

Another essential factor to enable the success and continuity of the domestic and family violence reforms is the ownership and leadership from community groups. For some stakeholders from the business sector, this sense of ownership was demonstrated through workplace guidelines and policies to embed domestic and family violence prevention and support into business-as-usual activities.

One stakeholder also reflected that an award received for their workplace’s efforts regarding domestic and family violence was an effective mechanism for validating and celebrating their efforts. It encouraged them to reflect and realise that it had been worth focusing on responding to domestic and family violence, and there was a sense of pride in being recognised as a leader within their sector in this respect. This suggests that rewards and recognition may provide an opportunity to encourage and validate work being undertaken to date, noting this was from one stakeholder only.

Stakeholders reflected on the ways the State Government could support sustained local engagement in the domestic and family violence reforms. Conversation predominantly focused on two areas – resources/information and funding. Types of resources stakeholders identified as potentially useful include information on how communities can engage in the reforms, facts about domestic and family violence, and templates for policies such as domestic and family violence leave. In terms of funding, it was noted that flexible grant-based funding could be helpful, particularly for those local councils that may not have the same resources as Mackay Regional Council. Flexible funding was specifically mentioned to ensure there was sufficient flexibility for initiatives to be community-led based on what would work in their community.

Any approach adopted by the State Government would seek to complement rather than duplicate the work currently being conducted by the Commonwealth Government through their Local Council Domestic and Family Violence Toolkit (currently being evaluated by ANROWS). This could include further targeting of these existing resources into Queensland local councils, particularly where there may be particular need identified as it relates to domestic and family violence.

H.7 Research question three: How can local government, businesses and the service sector collaborate to address domestic and family violence?

Stakeholders from the Council particularly noted the importance of ensuring the community-led nature of the Mackay Taskforce’s activities, emphasising the value of shared leadership between the Council and members of the Mackay Taskforce. Evidence suggested that some representatives of the community who are on the Taskforce are willing to take ownership of the domestic and family violence issue and prepared to drive progress of the activities within their own community.

Relationship building and the collaboration between the Mackay Regional Council and members of the Mackay Taskforce plays a major role to locally progress the domestic and family violence reforms. The Mackay Taskforce is a platform for networking. The Mackay Taskforce connects business representatives with other sectors such as research, policing and court systems, which can further inform businesses of the domestic and family violence statistics, reiterating the urgency and multi-faceted nature of the issue. Consultation inputs from the local businesses and specialist providers of domestic and family violence services indicated a constructive and collaborative

---

168 This comment was documented in acknowledgement that the State Government released ’A Domestic and Family Violence Workforce Support Package’ on 25 November 2015. The package includes a whole-of-government domestic and family violence directive, model policy template, template leadership commitment statement, communications toolkit, and other supporting resources. However, the stakeholder’s commentary in this context focused more on a need for a template for policies tailored to the business community to assist implementation of domestic and family violence initiatives in non-governmental organisations.

interaction among members of the Mackay Taskforce. The composition of the Mackay Taskforce, from these stakeholders’ perspectives, is sufficiently diverse to date, with a high level of commitment to driving positive changes for the local community and with every member being able to have their say in the Mackay Taskforce’s discussion.

Stakeholders commented understanding the role everyone played in responding to domestic and family violence was an important factor for encouraging collaboration. Everyone brought a unique perspective and expertise, whether it be around education, the role for business, or experiences as a first responder. Members listened to and respected these different perspectives and their contribution to the Mackay Taskforce.

The involvement of the service providers in the Mackay Taskforce was an important mechanism to enable access to the subject matter experts and improve understanding of the domestic and family violence sector through collaboration. The Mackay Taskforce meetings have taken a collaborative approach to encourage community members to share and validate ideas about domestic and family violence responses with those from the service sector. Stakeholders commented on the importance of sharing the subject matter expertise to provide appropriate and timely information to the broader community of the practicality of their intended actions. For example, the Mackay Taskforce sought and implemented advice from the service sector to plan its bin sticker campaign. The advice reflected that the campaign needed to be rolled-out in the local community in a way that resonates with the community. Stakeholders found it useful for businesses and the community in general, to be aware of the local service offerings and referral pathways, as can be shared by the domestic and family violence sector, to avoid situations when community members are interested to help but unsure of service options.

Taskforce members using their networks outside of the Mackay Taskforce has assisted in bringing together other parties to address domestic and family violence. Each member of the Mackay Taskforce has their own networks, formal and informal, they can leverage and collaborate with to drive progress to address domestic and family violence. This in turn creates a ripple effect throughout the community. Interlinkages and influence helps to grow engagement as a means of sustaining community involvement. For example, the Mackay Regional Council has links to the local Rotary Club. Through this connection, the Council has decided that proceeds from the 2019 Lord Mayor Ball will be awarded to the Mackay Women’s Centre. Specifically, funds will be used to pay for a child counsellor role, which was identified as a local area of need. Previously, funds went to multiple organisations. Businesses are connected through industry bodies. As stated by a member from the business sector, ‘we need to use Resource Industry Network, Queensland Resource Council and the broader industry to be the platform to get those messages out as we have all the tools to make that happen.’

Finally, stakeholders commented that sharing resources is a way to collaborate. This includes organisations being willing to share examples of policies and templates of domestic and family violence policies with other organisations to assist them in their response to domestic and family violence. While stakeholders were specifically referring to examples of sharing resources between other organisations in the community, this finding nonetheless mirrors the potential role for the State Government (identified in question two) to provide tools and templates that could be shared and adapted by others.

H.8 Research question four: What barriers and enablers are there to engaging local communities, including businesses, in taking ownership of the domestic and family violence reforms?

Committing resources was an enabler cited by stakeholders. For businesses and the internal-facing components of the Mackay Regional Council’s response, this included using their human resource departments to drive engagement in the reforms, for example through delivering training or updating policies to incorporate domestic and family violence leave. The Mackay Regional Council also contributed financially to the establishment, running and outputs of the Mackay Taskforce. This was a deliberate decision made by the Mackay Council to dedicate funds to addressing domestic and family violence in their community. It is important to recognise this as an enabler, as the same level of commitment may not be replicated elsewhere (including if local government does not have the resources to be able to provide financial support).
**Senior leadership including male involvement** was also an enabler for initiating a community-led response. Several stakeholders perceived that the active involvement of male leaders within the community, alongside female leaders, contributed to creating a whole-of-community response. In the example of Mackay, this included influential male figures such as the Mayor, Superintendent of Mackay District Office, Chief Executive Office of a major local business and local school principals. Male leaders visibly talking about and responding to domestic and family violence demonstrated that men were integral to the solution of preventing domestic and family violence, and were important for championing change.

Stakeholders commented that the **breadth of members on the Mackay Taskforce and their individual motivation** was an important factor in creating community ownership. Having representatives across sectors and types of organisations within the community meant each member was able to bring their own expertise and role. Mutual respect and willingness to learn from each other’s perspectives was considered highly valuable and effective. The motivation of those involved was also seen as an enabler. The Mackay Regional Council reflected that by opening the Mackay Taskforce to those who wanted to be involved (including invitations delegated to others), it attracted highly motivated and dedicated members of the community, which was ultimately a critical success factor.

A final enabler was **having a local approach relevant to the Mackay community**. This manifested in different ways. For example: using local statistics to explain the problem at the community level; connecting with expertise of those working in the local domestic and family violence sector; and developing their own local communications campaign suited to their community’s need.

In terms of barriers, there was recognition that smaller organisations may find it more difficult to contribute if they lack the resources; this included both smaller local councils and businesses. Businesses raised several other challenges to responding to domestic and family violence reforms. First, some reported progress may be limited where there exists competing priorities and busy schedules, particularly in busy periods when business as usual may be prioritised over responding to domestic and family violence.

They reported it was important that if they are raising awareness of domestic and family violence, then they needed to feel confident services were able to respond to potential increases in demand. If services are already experiencing high levels of demand (which they were perceived to be), then they were reluctant to focus on raising awareness of domestic and family violence in their workplace. For them, this was articulated in terms of a ‘duty of care’, and knowing that if their employees disclosed domestic and family violence that there were the appropriate supports in place.

Finally, they also mentioned that a barrier is that businesses may want to become involved in domestic and family violence, but do not know how to take appropriate action. In this sense, a lack of knowledge or understanding, or knowing where to find relevant information, may prevent businesses from engaging in taking such initiative. It was cited that the Mackay Taskforce has held a critical role in helping the local business community overcome this barrier through various mechanism such as open discussion, networking, relationship building and access to subject matter experts from the service sector.

**Conclusion**

The Mackay Regional Council has become a leader in its local response to addressing domestic and family violence, buoyed by the motivation and engagement of others in the community. While it has been imperative to have the leadership from the Mackay Regional Council, the key success factors also include a shared sense of ownership from community groups, including the education and business sectors, as well as domestic and family violence service sectors who are championing the changes in culture. Features that have worked well to encourage engagement include using localised information and data to maximise relevance and relatability for community members and businesses, recognised leaders (including males) with influence championing a response, and having a clearly articulated business case to encourage businesses to become involved. Having a regular forum with a breadth of stakeholders, particularly expertise from the service sector, has also assisted
in sustaining momentum. While this serves as a central body for sharing ideas, members are able to subsequently use their own networks to perpetuate the impact within the community.

Stakeholders identified that there may be an opportunity for the State Government to encourage local engagement through refreshing the dissemination of and/or issuing reminders for organisations to access government-released templates and resources,\textsuperscript{170} including examples of what others have done and any information that could be accessed for those wishing to engage in the reforms locally. Grant funding (which is more focused on ongoing initiative as opposed to one-off events) and other forms of recognition are helpful in continuing to assist particular initiatives or in locations that may have limited resources. However, it is important there is sufficient flexibility so that a place-based approach can be adopted. That is, sufficient scope for members of the community to design and deliver what is appropriate for the needs of their community, recognising what works will differ by context.

\textsuperscript{170} It is noted that the Queensland Government released a Domestic and Family Violence Workforce Support Package on 25 November 2015, including templates and a Referral Reference Pack providing examples of support services available and other supporting resources. All information is available publicly. Local government, business and non-government organisations are encouraged to adopt and/or tailor these templates and resources to meets the needs of their workplaces.
Appendix I : DHPW procurement policy case study

I.1 Overview of the case study
This case study comprises the following action related to DHPW:

- Develop and pilot guidance that supports procurement officers to consider if appropriate workplace policies are in place for contractors and suppliers to government that relate to domestic and family violence. This forms part of a broader range of initiatives of how government procures from ethically, environmentally and socially responsible suppliers.

It focuses on the commitment within the Queensland Procurement Policy to take into account workplace policies and practices aimed at ending domestic and family violence as part of supplier evaluation and selection (the commitment).

This action is aligned with supporting outcome three in the Second Action Plan:

*Queensland community, business, religious, sporting, and all government leaders are taking action and working together.*

I.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this case study have been formulated following a consultation with the Department of Housing and Public Works and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Process question (Fidelity):** Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?
- **Process question (Implementation):** What are the enablers and barriers to the effective implementation of the Second Action Plan? This may include processes and practices underpinning implementation, communication processes, data collection, evaluation and the timing of implementation.
- **Process question (Implementation):** How do these enablers or barriers differ by context? This includes at the agency, interagency and whole-of-government level, across locations (rural, regional, metropolitan) and types of initiatives?
- **Process question (Governance):** How effective have the governance arrangements been for delivering the Second Action Plan?
- **Outcome question 3.1:** Cultural change is led by communities across Queensland, working together to protect and support victims and model respectful relationships

The research questions consider the stage of the project. The key questions include:

1. What was the process for developing the commitment and related guidance materials to support delivery of the Queensland Procurement Policy?
2. To what extent has the commitment and related guidance materials, resulted in an increase in the presence of appropriate domestic and family violence workplace policies among contractors and suppliers to Queensland Government?
3. What are the benefits of the commitment and related guidance materials, to:
   a. DHPW
   b. other Queensland Government departments and agencies (also referred to as ‘government buyers’)
   c. contractors and suppliers to Queensland Government departments and agencies?
4. What are the lessons from development of the commitment, and related materials?
5. What have been the barriers and enablers of uptake of the commitment and related guidance materials?
6. How can use of the guidance materials be increased and sustained over time?
7. What other mechanisms are available to encourage behaviour change across suppliers?

The first three questions focus on understanding progress to date and answering the process and outcome evaluation questions. The remaining questions draw out key learnings to inform the Third Action Plan, including how these might be applied in other sectors.

I.3 Data sources
The following primary and secondary data sources were used to inform this case study:
- one 60-minute focus group with DHPW’s project delivery team
- one 30-minute semi-structured interview with a government buyer
- DHPW – ‘Guidance for Government Buyers’
- DHPW – Videos for suppliers, available via:
- DHPW – ‘Queensland Procurement Policy 2018’
- DHPW – ‘Recommendation closure report 42’
- DHPW – ‘Table of feedback into the internal facing guide 2019’

Engagement with government buyers from other agencies did not take place due to time constraints.

I.4 Research question one: What was the process for developing the commitment and related guidance materials to support delivery of the Queensland Procurement Policy?

Development of the policy commitment

In response to recommendation 42 of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, the Queensland Government has introduced changes to its procurement process via the Queensland Procurement Policy (QPP). It was first articulated in QPP 2017, under Principle 2, that the government, as a whole, would:

‘use our procurement to advance the government’s economic, environmental and social objectives, and support the long-term wellbeing of our community’.

This principle is elaborated using a list of procurement-related targets and commitments, similar across ‘Principle 1: Putting Queenslanders first when securing value for money’ and ‘Principle 2: Advancement of economic, environmental and social objectives’ within the QPP. Among the 14 government targets and commitments (including eight for economic, three for environmental and three for social objectives), the social commitment pertaining to addressing domestic and family violence states that the State Government:

‘Take into account workplace policies and practices aimed at ending domestic and family violence as part of supplier evaluation and selection’.

This policy is mandated for application to public sector organisations, including budget sector agencies, government owned corporations, statutory bodies and special purpose vehicles.171

Development of the guidance materials

To assist the implementation of this commitment, DHPW scoped and designed a prototype social procurement toolkit, consisting of internal and external facing materials, for government...
procurement officers and suppliers, respectively. The objective of the toolkit was to support procurement officers to use government procurement to advance the government’s social policy commitment, as well as for suppliers to respond to government tender and contract requirements.

In particular, the internal facing guide, titled ‘Ending Domestic and Family Violence – Guidance for Government Buyers’ was developed with an initial starting point of procurement knowledge, elaborated on based on a literature scan, and refined following testing with a working group of multiple agencies and with agencies going through WRA. It contains provisions for tender questions and contract clauses that allow for flexible use based on the size of the suppliers, types of engagement, etc. (e.g. provisions designed for promoting awareness or provisions for suppliers who may be expected to have personnel working on government premises under a contract). The guide also advises government buyers about when to use and how to assess a tender response question, as well as the wording for inclusion of clauses in a resulting contract. The external facing resources consist of videos that aim to provide a high-level introduction of social targets within the QPP more broadly, including to just domestic and family violence. There is also a hyperlink on the DHPW website for suppliers to access existing government resources on workplace package for domestic and family violence.

I.5 Research question two: To what extent has the commitment and related guidance materials, resulted in an increase in the presence of appropriate domestic and family violence workplace policies among contractors and suppliers to Queensland Government?

Stakeholders commented that it would be difficult to measure the extent of impacts by the QPP, as well as its guidance materials, on the increase of domestic and family violence workplace policies due to the lack of baseline information and of systematic collection of information regarding the declaration of supplier policies in place and/or inclusion of clauses in contracts. It is noted that the domestic and family violence performance indicators are being implemented from FY20 which may give an indication of directional trend over time, but are limited in their ability to determine the impact in the market overall, and which change could be attributed to the QPP.

There has been no data collected from suppliers to ascertain whether the external facing video resources are beneficial for their access to the government procurement process. Further investigation to gather evidence is required to determine the direction and scale of effects the guide has had on suppliers, and whether this differs by context (e.g. large suppliers vs small businesses).

I.6 Research question two: What are the benefits of the commitment and related guidance materials to DHPW, other Queensland Government departments and agencies (also referred to as ‘government buyers’) and contractors and suppliers to Queensland Government departments and agencies?

Feedback from some Queensland Government departments and agencies collected by DHPW at the end of 2018 echoed a positive sentiment around the use of the internal facing guide. Of the 16 comments from various agency representatives who provided feedback into the current version of the guide, four specifically highlighted how useful the guide has been as a resource to provide practical example clauses and enable users to assess when and how to use the contents. The other comments were constructive suggestions for improvement regarding the contents, but did not appear to request substantial revision of the resource. This positive feedback about the guide was consistent with consultation where stakeholders agreed that agency staff have benefited from the application of the guide during the procurement process, helping them understand how to apply the domestic and family violence elements of the QPP.

Anecdotal evidence indicates the toolkit and supporting sessions have been useful for encouraging establishment of the presence of workplace policies among suppliers that address domestic and family violence matters. Since 2017, the announced change to the QPP by the Palaszczuk Government to include the social commitment has signalled to the market the paramount

---
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importance that the government places on tackling domestic and family violence. Should suppliers have an interest in initiating or prolonging their business activities with government agencies, they know workplace policies pertaining to domestic and family violence will be a recurrent theme to address in tenders and contracts.

No clear evidence has been given on how the policy commitment and related guidance materials have benefited DHPW.

There is an intention to measure the impact of policy changes against a whole of government performance management reporting framework. A document to progress this is currently under development.

I.7 Research question four: What are the lessons from development of the commitment, and related materials?

With regard to the toolkit, the project team believed lessons learned from its development include user-testing with government agencies and engaging subject matter experts with domestic and family violence knowledge.

As such, a useful feature of the development process of the materials was user testing with government agencies. This involved testing example clauses with procurement officers from other departments and agencies, including PSC and DTMR. Given the context of limited interstate and international policy documents of the same nature, these considerations were helpful in shaping the guide, and ensuring its applicability to the Queensland context.

Another important lesson from the development of the resources emerges from engagement with subject matter experts in domestic and family violence. The project team stated it was helpful to consult with subject matter experts with specialist knowledge in domestic and family violence, including those from PSC, to ensure the resources were contemporary, used relevant language and highlighted the appropriate focus of information. They reflected that the engagement should have happened earlier than it did, to optimise the value of input from these specialists in the domestic and family violence field.

I.8 Research question five: What have been the barriers and enablers of uptake of the commitment and related guidance materials?

Barriers

Three barriers to uptake were raised during consultation, including difficulty responding to the multiple procurement related policy commitments, a potential misalignment of belief from those who see the procurement process as unrelated to addressing the domestic and family violence issue, and the different levels of maturity in the supplier market.

Some stakeholders discussed the potential challenge for procurement officers to fulfil, and suppliers to respond to, the QPP due to the spread of multiple targets and commitments in the policy, of which the social commitment pertaining to domestic and family violence is one. In fact, there are currently 14 government targets and commitments in the QPP 2018, which is mandated for application to government organisations. Stakeholders noted an increased level of difficulty to fulfil all of these procurement-related commitments when there are competing priorities as a government agency.

A second barrier to uptake could be the potential misalignment of perception and belief from some government buyers in agencies who see the procurement process as separate, and in fact distant, from the ability to address the issue of domestic and family violence. It is important that people involved in procurement understand why and how procurement can be a lever to contribute towards addressing the challenge of domestic and family violence. Little evidence is available to date as to whether there is information to enhance understanding of how procurement can act as a tool toward addressing domestic and family violence.

Stakeholders also reflected on another barrier regarding the variability in the maturity of the market. As such, some suppliers from professional services can have more developed responses in terms of social policies, which may not necessarily be the case for smaller businesses. To mitigate
this challenge, stakeholders believed the availability of example clauses has helped to allow for different ways in which the commitment can be applied into procurement activities. The types of example clauses can range from General acknowledgement, Workplace initiatives to Specific clause regarding behaviour of supplier personnel. It is important for the guide to remain adaptable and pragmatic to account for the different level of maturity of the market to avoid disadvantaging smaller suppliers.

**Enablers**

Identified enablers include leadership buy-in, interagency collaboration, promotion activities to raise awareness and encourage uptake, as well as the flexibility of the resources to suit different uses.

The first enabler of uptake was leadership buy-in. In particular, following the release of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, there was a clear mandate from the Premier, which flowed to Ministers and Director-Generals of government agencies. This resulted in strong commitment from agencies to implementing recommendations and actions, of which this policy commitment, together with its related guidance materials, is one.

**Ongoing collaboration and support** between DHPW and departments and agencies have also encouraged uptake of the policy commitment and the guide. This collaborative approach was not only limited to the development process, but also reflected in the ongoing sharing and addressing of feedback to refine the guidance materials. As such, procurement officers from Queensland Government departments and agencies are encouraged to email betterprocurement@hpw.qld.gov.au or respond to surveys administered by DHPW to provide feedback about the internal facing materials.174

To assist in raising awareness of the QPP and its guidance material, it was a regular topic on the Social Procurement Reference group meetings both during and after its publication.

Another factor that facilitates uptake is promotional activities, including sessions with both government buyers and suppliers, to raise awareness of the use of the toolkit. There have been more than 40 sessions across 17 locations on workplace policies and the toolkit, promoting the use of the guidance resources, and equipping the market with knowledge to formulate or enhance their policies relevant to domestic and family violence in response to the policy commitment.

Stakeholders also noted an enabler of uptake pertaining to the flexibility of the materials contained within the internal facing guide. This allows for the advice to be tailored subject to circumstances in terms of types of suppliers and maturity of the market.

**I.9 Research question six: How can use of the guidance materials be increased and sustained over time?**

Commentary from stakeholders indicates a process of providing and monitoring feedback as a way to sustain the use of the toolkit. This has been done via communication between DHPW and government agencies, such as through the betterprocurement@hpw.qld.gov.au mailbox or survey administration in late 2018. Findings from the survey have been collated by DHPW for potential improvements to the content of the materials. A revised version of the guide will be published upon the completion of the process.

**I.10 Research question seven: What other mechanisms are available to encourage behaviour change across suppliers?**

Driven by a policy commitment to address domestic and family violence issues, the toolkit helps the procurement officers to use procurement activities to influence the market. Little commentary is given on other mechanisms in place to facilitate behaviour change among suppliers. However, stakeholders believed that the influence of the toolkit can be improved. The requirement for workplace policies pertaining to domestic and family violence should occur earlier on in the procurement process (e.g. tendering), as opposed to contracting, to target a wider pool of potential suppliers.

---

suppliers or businesses. As the market matures, some agencies have started to strengthen their requirements for tenderers, e.g. from asking ‘Yes/No’ in tender questions to requesting evidence of suppliers’ workplace policies and procedures.

I.1.1 Conclusion
This case study highlights the use of large levers available to government to influence others. In this way, the Queensland Government is able to demonstrate leadership to drive change. To implement the Queensland Government’s commitment to addressing domestic and family violence, DHPW was responsible for incorporating a social target in the QPP and developing guidance materials to help the market navigate responses to this policy commitment. Under strong leadership from government, this initiative has demonstrated an innovative use of large levers through procurement available to government to help address the issue of domestic and family violence.

Important lessons learned from the development of the policy commitment and guidance materials include the need to engage government agencies and subject matter experts in testing and refining materials. It has been, and will continue to be, important for the guidance materials to remain adaptable and pragmatic to account for the factors such as variability in the maturity of the market and sizes of businesses to avoid disadvantaging smaller suppliers. It is also critical to consider the feedback loop as a way to revisit and sustain the use of these resources over time. Where relevant, the Performance Monitoring and Reporting Framework will be important to monitor progress and impact of the initiative. Of note, future investigation is warranted to explore and monitor the use of the external facing guide.
Appendix J : QH case study – referral model

J.1 Overview of case study
This case study comprises one action related to QH:

- To work in partnership with DVConnect to develop a model to provide immediate access to specialist domestic and family support and referral services within public and private maternity hospitals and emergency departments.

This action is aligned with supporting outcome five within the Second Action Plan: Victim survivors and their families are safe and supported.

J.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following a consultation with QH and DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- Supporting outcome five, intermediate outcome 5.3: To what extent has the Strategy facilitated improved access to appropriate and responsive services to victims of domestic and family violence?

The research questions consider the stage of implementation and operation of the action. The key questions include:

1. How effective have the programs been in building system capability in providing support to victims?
   a. How have services embedded the resources in business-as-usual?
2. What are the opportunities for scaling the action including across different healthcare settings?
3. What factors can ensure the sustainability of the face-to-face training that supports the referral model across HHSs?
4. How has the relevance and usefulness of the resources been maintained (i.e., content is up to date and responding to need)?
   a. How effective has this been?
   b. Who takes responsibility for this?
5. What are the key learnings to apply to other models that offer online resources supported by face-to-face training?

J.3 Data sources
The development of this case study has been informed by a review of secondary data sources, supplemented by primary research, including but not limited to:

- Two semi-structured interviews with HHSs;
- Three written responses from HHSs;
- QH, Recommendation Closure Report 58, February 2017;
- QH, Domestic and Family Violence Referral to Specialist Support Services Model, 2017;
- QH, Response to disclosure flowchart; How to make a referral flowchart, 2017; and

QH is working with stakeholders to undertake a process evaluation and content review of QH’s Domestic and Family Violence Toolkit of Resources. Updates to the Toolkit will be published later in 2019.
J.4 Overview of the action

The referral model is a set of guidance material developed by QH and distributed to HHSs to assist in building capacity within the healthcare workforce to identify and appropriately refer patients experiencing domestic and family violence through building knowledge and skills. Secondary data suggests that the intention of this model is to ultimately lead to safer and more appropriate responses to meet the needs of victim survivors of domestic and family violence within the public health system.

The material includes a booklet outlining the ‘Referral to specialist support services model’, and a flow chart that provides a one-page step-by-step guide on how to refer and what to do in the event of disclosure. The information is guidance material only and is not intended to be a protocol.

The referral model was supplemented with a Domestic and Family Violence Toolkit of Resources, published in October 2016. The supplementary material as part of the Toolkit included:

- Two online training modules (understanding domestic and family violence and clinical response to domestic and family violence)
- Printable resources
- Train-the-trainer program including a facilitator’s guide.

According to QH’s secondary data, between October 2016 and March 2017 train-the-trainer sessions were delivered to more than 400 health clinicians in 29 sites across all HHSs and the private hospital sector.

A program logic of the action is shown in Figure J.1.

Figure J.1 Program logic for delivering the referral model

J.5 Research question one: How effective have the programs been in building system capability in providing support to victims? How have services embedded the resources as business-as-usual

This case study relied on HHS self-reporting the effectiveness of the referral model.

Impacts of the referral model implementation:

Feedback on the effectiveness of the referral model resources was mixed. Where the referral model was working well, there appeared to be two consistent messages: increases in referral numbers and the quality of the referrals. One HHS estimated referrals had doubled. Two HHSs commented that the quality of referrals had improved. This included more thorough risk assessments and improving the information provided to the domestic and family violence service provider.
Enablers and barriers of the referral model implementation
As an enabler of the model uptake, the HHS with increased referral numbers attributed it in part to the health liaison role, which meant patients had a personal connection with the domestic and family violence worker prior to accepting the referral. They stated the liaison role had increased healthcare staff's confidence in the model and shown them it is a more responsive model than where the state-wide number was used. Evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of the model supported acceptance and uptake of the referrals by practitioners.

The HHSs with improved referral quality emphasised the role of specialists within the referral model, particularly social workers. For example, one of the HHS had placed the referral model pathway in places for healthcare workers to see, with the social worker number to contact to assist with referrals. The other HHS had also promoted the role of the social worker, supplemented with the domestic and family violence service health liaison officer. Another commonality mentioned by both these services was the willingness of the hospital to admit or keep patients in the hospital until a safe discharge plan could be arranged.

There were two barriers to the delivery of training programs that are intended to increase referral support to victims. First, while several HHSs noted the importance to have senior leadership to champion and prioritise the initiative within the service, some stakeholders noted this can be limited where there is no funding incentives to promote accountability. Second, stakeholders lamented that it is difficult to drive uptake of training when it is not mandatory, and it is competing with other mandatory training requirements. This is exacerbated given the significant existing training requirements for healthcare workers, and that the allocation of time to complete training must be appropriately balanced against other obligations including clinical work.

Two HHSs also linked these two challenges, stating that training, including online modules, was not always taken up because of a lack of someone championing the material and having accountability for driving uptake. Absence of senior leadership to champion the work, the consequence of which is that domestic and family violence training/referrals are not seen as a priority or core business by healthcare staff. This shows the need for a dedicated, funded role to promote the resources and be a central point of call across the HHSs.

A final barrier of the effectiveness of the referral model was ensuring clinicians also understood the cultural aspect in implementing the referral model, e.g. in rural areas where there are more Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Embedding the resources as business-as-usual
Many HHSs have developed close working relationships with the local domestic and family violence support service, to provide stronger integrated service responses. There are examples where this has been done on an informal and formal basis. Informally, several HHSs described that they had developed close links with local services. One HHS meanwhile stated it was currently developing a memorandum of understanding between the hospital and service; demonstration of a more formal agreement. The latter was identified as a mechanism to ensure the referral model remained useful, as it enabled referrals in crisis situations after hours when social workers were not on shift at the hospital. In another example of how close working relationships are essential yet differ across sites, one HHS has created a health liaison role, in which an employee of the local domestic and family violence service is located at the hospital one day per week. Their role is to accept warm referrals, and to provide referral support including answering any questions healthcare practitioners may have. On days where they are not at the hospital, the referrals are prioritised by the domestic and family violence service.

Another emerging theme was how HHSs have used the referral model as a basis, and developed other initiatives that extend its use. For example, one HHS found that the healthcare staff wanted a discrete method of communicating referral options to patients to explain the referral model to patients. The latter was considered particularly important given perpetrators can often be present, particularly in maternity wards where the request for the tool occurred. This innovative approach has enabled healthcare staff on the maternity ward to ensure the referral model remains useful to patients beyond their stay at the hospital, and that they can self-refer at a later date if/when they want to. The stakeholders interviewed stated this also enabled victim survivors to have control over
the referral process. Another way to ensure the relevance and usefulness of the material, as raised by an HHS, was to simply have the materials easily accessible by staff. They had printed out the referral model pathway and placed laminated copies in the hospital for healthcare professionals to easily refer to.

Training was also a recurring theme to ensure the referral model remains useful, however this at times posed challenges (also discussed later). For example, one HHS expressed difficulty in accessing the training where the link to the resources was not updated on their intranet. Exacerbating this is the challenge associated with healthcare workers having time to complete non-mandatory training.

J.6 Research question two: What are the opportunities for scaling the action, including across different health settings?

There appears to be variation in how HHS have adopted and embedded the referral model within their HHS, with varying success. There was also a common theme around localisation and building a referral network and pathway in a local context. Rather than focus on scaling, which was largely not discussed in the consultations to date, it may be worth first considering what has worked in other HHSs and why, which could be adopted elsewhere. This will help to ensure effectiveness within the current model, prior to scaling further. Challenges in regional and remote areas was also raised, though not elaborated further other than those arising from high staff turnover.

J.7 Research question three: What factors can ensure the sustainability of the face-to-face training that supports the referral model across HHSs?

The sustainability of the model seems to differ by HHS based on a number of enablers that have supported its uptake. This includes the level of prioritisation within the HHS, driven in part by leadership.

Given the challenges associated with accessing training, including the fact that providing and completing domestic and family violence training is generally not mandatory, it may also be important to consider alternative approaches to incentivising or delivering training to encourage its uptake. This could be supplemented by other mechanisms, in addition to training, that drive use of the referral model, including:

- Ensuring prominence of the referral model, including contacts for making a referral
- Promoting the role of the social worker within the referral model, and making this clearer
- Increasing linkages with the domestic and family violence service, including by embedding expertise within the HHS.

These options may encourage uptake in so far as healthcare staff know who to contact to assist with the referrals in the first instance.

J.8 Research question four: How has the relevance and usefulness of the resources been maintained (i.e., content is up to date and responding to need)? How effective has this been? Who takes responsibility for this?

As the referral model and training is relatively new, there is currently little evidence to show how the materials will be kept up to date on an ongoing basis. What is apparent, however, is how HHSs have adopted slightly different approaches to ensure the materials are relevant to their particular contexts. While there are common themes in the approaches taken to ensuring the ongoing relevance of the materials, such as close working relationships and challenges associated with training, the specific nuances of how they do this differs by context.

J.9 Research question five: What are the key learnings to apply to other models that offer online resources supported by face-to-face training?

One of the main learnings in seeking to drive uptake of training is how this can be incentivised and encouraged across HHSs. This includes consideration of:

- Whether or not the training is mandatory or voluntary
• The need to achieve an appropriate balance between training and delivery of core services of the target audience
• Competition with existing training priorities.

One mechanism to consider is how senior leadership can be encouraged to champion the role of HHS staff in recognising, responding and referring for domestic and family violence. Such senior buy-in could also signal to HHS staff the importance of the training resources and engagement with the referral model.

J.10 Conclusion
With reference to the referral model, the approach to implementation has varied across HHSs in response to their unique contexts. Most stakeholders agreed that training is considered integral to ensuring awareness and take up of the referral model. A barrier to training is balancing the time required to attend training with delivery of core business. The reported enablers of training are senior leadership championing participation and local champions available to promote and deliver training. Local champions of the referral model are considered integral to ensuring awareness and take-up of the referral model, while funded roles can be responsible for championing the referral model (including training) and providing support to HHS staff in making referrals. Ensuring prominence of the referral model and embedding domestic and family violence provider expertise within the HHS are also effective in ensuring awareness and take-up of referrals. Where the referral model has been taken up, HHSs have seen improvements in the number and quality of referrals (self-reported).
Appendix K: DCSYW case study – services for culturally and linguistically diverse clients

K.1 Overview of the case study
This case study comprises one action for which the DCSYW holds responsibility:

- Continue to work in partnership with the CALD community and the domestic and family violence service system to develop culturally appropriate services.

This action is aligned with supporting outcomes one and five in the Second Action Plan:

- Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence (SO1);
- Victims and their families are safe and supported (SO5).

K.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following a consultation with DCSYW and DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Outcome question one (SO1), intermediate outcome 1.2:** How effective has the Strategy been in informing victims and perpetrators about where to go for help?
- **Outcome question five (SO5), intermediate outcome 5.1:** Has the Strategy helped build culturally appropriate service responses that meet the needs of victim survivors?

The research questions consider the stage of implementation and operation of the action. The key questions include:

1. How effective have the actions been in meeting the needs of victim survivors and perpetrators from CALD backgrounds?
   a) Are there any practical examples others can learn from/replicate?
2. How effective have the programs been in building mainstream system capability in working with CALD and refugee communities?
   a) What are the learnings from this that can be applied elsewhere?
   b) Are there any practical examples others can learn from/replicate?
3. What are the opportunities for scaling the action to enhance reach?

The first two questions focus on understanding progress to date and answering outcome evaluation questions one and five. Question two a) and three focus on drawing out key learnings to inform the Third Action Plan, including how these might be applied elsewhere.

K.3 Data sources
The following primary and secondary data sources were used to inform this case study:

- One one-hour semi-structured interview with the delivery team from the DCSYW;
- Two one-hour semi-structured interviews with two service providers commissioned to deliver the action;
- DCSYW – ‘Request for quote: Domestic and Family Violence Services South East Region Stage 4A’ – August 2016;
K.4 Overview of the action
This action is overseen by DCSYW and comprised several steps. First, DCSYW established two specialist domestic and family violence services in Logan and at the Gold Coast for people from CALD backgrounds. These services were in addition to the existing specialist CALD service already operating in Brisbane.

About newly-established services funded under the action
The newly-established service in Logan is 99 Steps (via Access Community Services Ltd as the prime contractor), and on the Gold Coast, it is Multicultural Family Organisation Inc. These service providers are contracted under ‘community services’ stream on a five-year term (from 01 Jan 2017 to 31 Dec 2021) to offer domestic violence counselling support for female victim survivors. The Logan and Gold Coast services have been contracted to deliver 2,600 hours and 3,000 hours counselling or equivalent per annum, respectively. According to the funding schedules, both services are also funded to provide cultural-appropriateness training for the broader service system towards CALD service delivery. However, consultation indicated that demand for delivering services to victims does not allow much capacity for capability building support.

About existing services funded under the action
The Brisbane-based Immigrant Women’s Support Service (IWSS), however, is funded under the ‘women’ stream to provide centre-based case management for female victim survivors of domestic and family violence with CALD backgrounds. IWSS current contract runs between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2023. During this period they are funded to provide 4,347 hours of support per annum. Commentary from stakeholder consultation has indicated that IWSS will also play an increasingly important role in providing specialist ad hoc support to mainstream providers, however it was noted that they are not explicitly funded for this function.

Other components of the action
The Workforce Capacity and Capability Building (WCCB) program is another essential component of this action. The broad purpose of the program is to upskill the Queensland domestic and family violence sector workforce to be better equipped to meet the needs of both victim survivors and perpetrators from vulnerable population groups, with people from CALD backgrounds identified through initial needs analysis research as a priority area. This piece of work has been scoped and co-designed with the sector, and is currently being procured by DCSYW.

As part of this action, the Queensland Government provided approximately $2.1 million in the 2016–2017 budget to fund the Community Action for a Multicultural Society (CAMS) program, delivered by the Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs. This investment was directed to 19 community-based organisations based on their proposals of evidence-based activities in response to the needs of the local CALD communities, with an overall goal to achieve greater social connectedness for individuals and communities from CALD backgrounds. While CAMS is not solely focused on the issue of domestic and family violence, a number of initiatives endorsed within this program have contributed to improving domestic and family violence awareness and prevention. Examples of these activities include:

- Hervey Bay Neighbourhood Centre working to connect local women from CALD backgrounds with domestic violence support services
- Islamic Women’s Association of Queensland running workshops to promote domestic violence awareness
- MDA Ltd holding regular community leaders’ gatherings to share approaches to addressing domestic and family violence
Multilink Community Services delivering two Pasifika Family and Security Fonos to assist Pacific Island communities in working towards family safety.

Other steps performed by DCSYW to deliver this action included:

- Establishing requirements for all funded domestic and family violence services to work with and be accessible to diverse groups. However, there is limited information available regarding the extent to which these requirements have been developed or implemented.

- Reviewing practice standards for working with domestic and family violence victim survivors and perpetrators, as well as developing new standards for working with children and young people, to ensure that all practice standards remain culturally appropriate.

A program logic of this action is shown in Figure K.1.

Figure K.1 Program logic of enabling action 13, Second Action Plan

The project aims to: Continue to work in partnership with the culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) community and the domestic and family violence service system to develop culturally appropriate services

K.5 Research question one: How effective have the actions been in meeting the needs of victim survivors and perpetrators from CALD backgrounds?

Anecdotal evidence from stakeholder consultations reported there had been progress for both victim survivors from CALD backgrounds, mainly in the area of awareness raising of domestic and family violence. To date, services commissioned by DCSYW towards the delivery of this action have placed a primary focus on female victim survivors and some success has been achieved. Establishment of two new services in the Gold Coast and Logan-Beenleigh has increased the reach of specialist services to better meet the needs of the communities in these catchments. These two areas were chosen due to high demand. Logan-Beenleigh reported that there is sustained demand for services, indicating the service is needed.

Consultations indicated that there remains limited culturally-appropriate service responses to meet the needs of perpetrators. It was noted that there are two related but separate needs in this area: programs or services for perpetrators who, themselves, are from CALD backgrounds; and programs or services for perpetrators who are not from CALD backgrounds, but perpetrate violence against people from CALD backgrounds. As well as programs or services for primary perpetrators, there has also been limited progress to support adolescents and children exposed to domestic and family violence in these scenarios who may begin to manifest signs of violent behaviours.
Given the progress for the capability building component, it is likely there has been minimal effect on the ability of mainstream providers to meet the needs of people from CALD backgrounds beyond the ad hoc support provided by the services supporting people from CALD backgrounds.

There has also been increased interest from CALD organisations to apply for DFVPM grants to fund activities to raise community awareness. Steps have also been taken to develop specific materials on domestic and family violence in several languages for people from CALD backgrounds.

**Enablers of success:**

Of these specialist supports targeting victim survivors, stakeholder consultations revealed that the effectiveness of specialist services requires practitioners who have a depth of cross cultural knowledge of, and experience in, domestic and family violence. It was noted in particular, that a case management model was required for people from CALD backgrounds in this context, as distinct from domestic and family violence counselling in isolation. This was due to the often complex scenarios associated with visa or immigration issues and often little or no access to income, limiting options. From the domestic and family violence specialist services’ perspective, whether a service can be effective in serving its clients’ needs is subject to the combination of both an evidence-based service model, and an appropriate implementation approach, including the recruitment of appropriate personnel with subject matter knowledge in working with people from CALD backgrounds.

Another factor contributing to effectiveness is the good network between services to negotiate timely, safe and appropriate solutions to accommodate the needs of clients from CALD backgrounds. An example was raised by stakeholders when a victim survivor from a CALD background experienced difficulty entering crisis accommodation when she arrived with several children. Thanks to a good working relationship between her domestic and family violence case manager and a housing provider, the client was able to be promptly referred to crisis accommodation.

**Barriers to success:**

In terms of barriers impeding progress of work for clients from CALD backgrounds more broadly, the lack of capacity in the mainstream domestic and family violence service sector was raised during consultation. This is highlighted in instances where victim survivors from CALD backgrounds may seek support from mainstream domestic and family violence services, who do not always have the capability or capacity to manage the broader complicating factors of the case. A fundamental element of the capacity to work with clients from CALD backgrounds is the consideration and adoption of culturally-appropriate practice. This is paramount as the vulnerability of individuals and population groups from CALD backgrounds is often exacerbated by being away from countries of origin, friends and families, as well as potentially having limited English and little knowledge of the Australian legal and welfare systems. With a view to addressing this barrier, DCSYW is progressing the roll-out of the WCCB project to upskill the mainstream service providers, as well as reviewing and ensuring providers' compliance with practice standards for working with clients from CALD backgrounds.

To remove the language barrier, stakeholders consulted consistently acknowledged the need for increased awareness among all domestic and family violence services in general regarding access to interpreters through the Telephone Interpreter Service (TIS National). The DCSYW encourages funded non-government services, including domestic and family violence services, to send invoices for TIS services to them for reimbursement, noting interpreters without National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters should only be used when a qualified interpreter is unavailable or in an emergency. Also, clients need to be made aware of their entitlements and ethical rights regarding the use of interpreters, particularly during interactions with the mainstream system. It was also noted as important to make clients aware that there are national and confidential services available, as there are often concerns that interpreters from within victim survivors’ communities or families will be used.

Of note, commissioning services that may not directly address the needs of victim survivors from CALD backgrounds was another critical factor that could hinder success. While both the Logan-Beenleigh and Gold Coast services were contracted to deliver counselling, there were concerns
whether this would particularly fit with the prioritisation of needs by CALD clients. Although domestic violence counselling is important, it was noted that this may not necessarily incentivise a client with a CALD background to access specialist domestic and family violence services. In fact, a migration or visa issue may be the initial impetus for entry into the service system.

K.6  Research question two: How effective have the programs been in building mainstream system capability in working with CALD and refugee communities?

The WCCB project seeks to play a major role in upskilling the mainstream system to respond to the needs of vulnerable population groups, people from CALD backgrounds identified through initial needs analysis research as a priority. Following the needs analysis research, the WCCB has engaged key stakeholders from the sector, and potential delivery providers, to carry out a co-design process for the procurement specification to ensure it will meet the content and delivery needs of the sector.

There is little commentary in regard to WCCB by stakeholders at this point due to the early stage of the project.

In the absence of this formalised agreement to provide capability building to enable mainstream services to meet the needs of people from CALD backgrounds and refugee communities, specialist service providers for people from CALD backgrounds in Brisbane and Logan-Beenleigh are providing ad hoc support to mainstream service providers. The extent to which Gold Coast has also been providing such support is unknown.

K.7  Research question three: What are the opportunities for scaling the action to enhance reach?

The opportunities for scaling up this activity exist in the approach taken to growing domestic and family violence service sector capability and developing CALD-specific services.

Stakeholders have mentioned a few potential opportunities to scale up CALD service delivery through forming partnerships with appropriate organisations, exploring extra resources, and addressing the gaps in service provision for perpetrators and for children and adolescents.

Stakeholders indicated an opportunity to expand the implementation of the action via appropriate partnerships. For instance, to understand the complications with migration law and visa matters that are often present in the situation of a female victim survivor from a CALD background escaping a violent partner, it is beneficial for the client to have access to a service partner that offers legal support, e.g. the Refugees and Immigration Legal Service (RAILS). Some female clients may need access to housing at a refuge which cannot normally accommodate a family with several children. It is important that CALD service providers, as case managers, are aware of these special needs, and are able access help from services in their network to provide housing alternatives to meet the client’s needs.

Another potential consideration in the CALD context is the opportunity for more resources through charitable organisations which will become especially useful for services that do not have emergency relief money available. Also, it is important to acknowledge the existing gaps pertaining to service provision for perpetrators and young people from CALD backgrounds exposed to, and starting to manifest, domestic violent behaviours. Although there are similar gaps in the Queensland population more broadly, the approaches taken to respond to these issues in the CALD context will necessitate cultural appropriate considerations.

It should be noted that people from CALD backgrounds consist of multiple population groups with heterogeneous needs requiring service responses to understand further diversity within a diverse population.

K.8  Conclusion

There are unique challenges faced by clients from CALD backgrounds experiencing or perpetrating domestic and family violence. Domestic and family violence services focused on meeting the needs of clients from CALD backgrounds, report some progress for victims, and limited progress for perpetrators.
It is important to acknowledge key enablers of outcomes, including building good provider networks and prioritising case management. Steps should also be taken to address barriers by building capability and raising awareness of available resources for providers who work with clients from CALD backgrounds, as well as making evidence-based funding decisions for services that capture the culturally-appropriate and diverse needs of people from CALD backgrounds. The upcoming roll-out of the WCCB should be a critical component to upskill mainstream services and help providers overcome the barrier due to the lack of capability.
Appendix L : Disability and Elder Abuse Trial (DEAT) case study

L.1 Overview of the case study
This case study relates to the Disability and Elder Abuse Trial (DEAT). This is a joint initiative between QPS Gold Coast Police District and DCDSS. The purpose of the DEAT is to:

- Identify referral and reporting pathways for people with disabilities and older people impacted by domestic and family violence
- Identify and facilitate warm referrals for victim survivors to an appropriate agency for care and/or follow up
- Identify opportunities to increase the disability sector awareness, knowledge and capability development
- Gather information and knowledge of this cohort to enable development of improved long-term responses.

The trial period, from 23 November 2018 to 22 March 2019, is scoped to address cases within the Gold Coast Local Government Area (LGA) and policing area.¹⁷⁵

This action relates to the equity outcome evaluation question and supporting outcomes five and seven.

L.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following discussions with representatives from the DEAT at DCDSS and QPS, and DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Outcome question seven (SO7), intermediate outcome 7.1:** How effective has the justice system process been in providing coordinated, consistent and timely responses to domestic and family violence matters? (supporting outcome seven)?
- **Outcome question five (SO5), intermediate outcome 5.3:** To what extent has the strategy facilitated improved access to appropriate and responsive services to victim survivors of domestic and family violence? (supporting outcome five)
- **Equity question:** To what extent has progress been made to address equity priorities for vulnerable population groups?

The research questions consider the stage of the project. The key questions include:

1. What are the features of the DEAT model and how have these been operationalised?
2. How effective has the DEAT model been at:
   a. Increasing knowledge among service providers and QPS about domestic and family violence among people with disability and older people and how to respond
   b. Improving responsiveness of services (QPS, domestic and family violence services and disability and aged services) to victim survivors
3. What changes, if any, has DEAT brought about for:
   a. Clients (victim survivors and perpetrators)
   b. Service providers (the domestic and family violence service sector and the disability and aged care service sectors)
   c. Government agencies (QPS, DCDSS)

¹⁷⁵ QPS. (no date). Evaluation Framework - Disability and Elder Abuse Trial.
4. What are the learnings from the model that can be applied to other models to improve knowledge/awareness of domestic and family violence experiences among people with disability/older people?

L.3 Data sources
The following primary and secondary data sources were used to inform this case study:
- one one-hour semi-structured interview with the embedded officer from DCDSS
- one one-hour semi-structured interview with the Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce (DFVT or Gold Coast Taskforce)
- one one-hour semi-structured interview with the project delivery team
- DCDSS – ‘Background paper and meeting minutes’
- DCDSS – ‘DEAT information sheet’
- QPS – ‘DEAT evaluation framework’
- QPS – ‘DEAT as of 26 Feb 2019’

L.4 Research question one: What are the features of the DEAT model and how have these been operationalised?

The DEAT model has two key features, the first of which pertains to human capital while the other feature is process-related and built on the existing procedure in the QPS Taskforce (see Figure L.1).176

Figure L.1 Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce Operating Diagram

In terms of the human capital feature, the DEAT model has involved the new appointment of an embedded DCDSS officer in QPS to provide constant and timely support for the Gold Coast Taskforce. Based on stakeholders’ understanding that was shared during consultation, this officer is responsible for providing guidance and support to the Gold Coast Taskforce in domestic and family violence matters among people living with disability and older people. Capability building also includes

176 DCDSS and QPS. DEAT evaluation framework.
awareness raising of referral pathways for the target cohorts. Seconded by DCDSS to QPS, the officer works on-site at Gold Coast QPS to participate in triage and provide ad hoc support for the Gold Coast Taskforce. This officer also engages with service providers in the Gold Coast District to promote awareness and understanding of referral avenues, facilitate relationships and build networks among service providers. The officer carries out sector engagement, often in tandem with QPS personnel from the Gold Coast Taskforce with the ability to bring both perspectives and the intention of rebuilding relationships and trust of the sector in QPS.

Anecdotally, stakeholders noted that there has been a history of perceived mistrust of the QPS by disability and aged care service providers of potentially not taking claims of disability or elder abuse seriously. This includes not comprehensively investigating claims. To empower the sector to recognise and report suspected cases of abuse, and for the DEAT model to be effective, this trust needs to be regained.

Regarding the process-related feature, the DEAT model has introduced a focus on disability and elder abuse into the existing procedure of how domestic and family violence matters are responded to and progressed within the policing service in the Gold Coast district. As a result, there are at least three flow-on changes to the traditional policing responses:

- The triage, as an essential component of the Gold Coast Taskforce’s operation, has evolved to incorporate the voices of the disability and aged care sectors to enable sharing of information across agencies and sectors, with the embedded officer participating in the triage case conferences alongside personnel from QPS, courts, QCS (including Probation and Parole), DCSYW, and Domestic Violence Prevention Centre. Information shared during triage includes case history, any signs of domestic and family violence, as well as available service responses from the disability, aged care and domestic and family violence sectors, to enable a collective built of cases and exchange of detail that may have been under-reported.

- The Gold Coast Taskforce has also taken another step in its policing responses to review domestic and family violence cases to identify any signs that the victim survivor or perpetrator has a disability, or signs of elder abuse, that are not reported. In some instances, this process involves the Gold Coast Taskforce consulting with the embedded DCDSS officer on-site for specialist knowledge in disability and aged care sectors. Stakeholders noted that the review allows for patterns of seemingly innocuous perpetrator behaviour to be captured and identified, providing important intelligence to inform proactive responses. In addition, where there may be a perceived mistrust of the QPS of potentially not taking claims of disability or elder abuse seriously, the review can provide a mechanism to engender and build trust with the broader service sector. Stakeholders highlighted the importance to investigate all claims regardless of perceived severity, and loop back to referrers with the outcomes of investigations.

- The relationship network has been strengthened to facilitate referrals between QPS and sector providers such as disability services, aged care support and domestic and family violence specialist providers. This was indicated via consultations with sector providers who self-reported an improved process of communication about and facilitation of referrals with QPS following the start of the DEAT. Stakeholders commented that this improvement could be due to the work of representatives from the Gold Coast Taskforce and the embedded officer. Also, this strengthened relationship network can be attributed to the open lines of communication between QPS and the broader sector, which has materialised due to the feedback loop involved with investigating a claim and notifying referrers with the outcomes of investigations.

According to stakeholders, these adaptations from traditional policing responses are important in building a holistic picture of each case, allowing for better opportunities for police to act on prevention, responses and referrals in incidents involving domestic and family violence in the most timely and efficient manner.
L.5  Research question two: How effective has the DEAT model been at:

(a) increasing knowledge among service providers and QPS about domestic and family violence among people with disability and elder abuse and how to respond

(b) improving responsiveness of services (QPS, domestic and family violence services and disability and aged services) to victim survivors

The DEAT model has made early progress in improving the knowledge of domestic and family violence matters, as well as how to respond to domestic and family violence, occurring among older Queenslanders and people living with disability. These increased levels of awareness and understanding have been reported among members of the Gold Coast Taskforce and sector providers, including disability services, elder abuse support and aged care providers. Stakeholders commented on the usefulness of having the embedded officer, a key feature of the DEAT model, to build awareness and capacity in domestic and family violence matters among people with disability and older people. For example, the embedded officer can raise awareness through running activities with sector providers such as disability services and aged care. The officer can also build capability for members of the Gold Coast Taskforce, allowing them to be better at identifying, responding and referring to domestic and family violence among the target population groups. Applicable for both service providers and the QPS Taskforce, this awareness and capacity building includes, but is not limited to, improved understanding of particular needs of victim survivors and perpetrators in the target cohorts, greater knowledge of how to respond, as well as better awareness of service availability and referral pathways. Stakeholders indicated an improved level of confidence in working with domestic and family violence matters to meet the needs of the target cohorts. Of note, members of the Gold Coast Taskforce acknowledged an increased awareness of the complexity pertaining to the identification of intellectual disability among domestic and family violence victim survivors and/or perpetrators. This will be discussed later in research question four regarding the lessons learned.

The DEAT model has also effectively improved policing responses and providers of disability, aged care and domestic and family violence support. According to stakeholders, this could be partly attributed to the improved integration resulting from the work of the embedded officer. Relationship building and capability building facilitated by this officer have contributed to ensuring integrated responses in an appropriate and timely manner. Stakeholders also mentioned information sharing between relevant organisations as another reason for improved service responsiveness. Apart from expediting service responses, stakeholders believed that the combined effects of improved connectedness between QPS and the provider network would allow for intervening earlier, enhance sustainability of responses, and reduce the volume of crisis responses needed. For example, where patterns of seemingly innocuous perpetrator behaviour are identified during reviews of cases, which are reported as offences other than domestic and family violence, police can perform proactive responses as appropriate to prevent further domestic and violence incidents.

L.6  Research question three: What changes, if any, has the DEAT brought about for:

a. Clients (victim survivors and perpetrators)

b. Service providers (the domestic and family violence service sector and the disability and aged care service sectors)

c. Government agencies (QPS, DCDSS)

d. Changes for clients (victim survivors and perpetrators):

The work of the DEAT model revolves around the needs of victim survivors and perpetrators with disability and/or older people. From stakeholders’ perspectives, the model is conceptualised with an appreciation of human rights, aiming to achieve equitable outcomes and meet the needs of population groups such as people with disability and older people. Based on the case studies provided by the DEAT as of 26 February 2019, the trial has been able to generate better service responses
for a number of people in these target cohorts. In some instances, referrals were made by triage members to provide clients with timely information about or access to services that they would not otherwise be aware of. In other examples, triage members were able to take prompt action to discuss further options in the interests of clients with relevant agencies (e.g. Office of the Public Guardian), thanks to the shared information feature embedded in the DEAT. This has enabled clients to get referred as appropriate to services and support that they may not be aware of otherwise. Due to the short tenure of the trial to date, it is unclear whether there have been any longer-term outcomes for clients.

(a) Changes for service providers (the domestic and family violence service sector and the disability and aged care service sectors):

From the service providers’ perspectives, there has been an overall improvement in awareness and understanding of interagency and inter-sectoral information to be considered in a client’s case. Resulting from better coordination, awareness raising and relationship building facilitated during the trial, service providers could obtain a shared information platform and improve their collaboration with QPS. Consultations with providers also revealed that they found it helpful to receive regular reminders of referral pathways and resources during the DEAT. Further comments from a service provider indicated another positive impact from the trial, which is a potential to overcome siloed work within the provider network and ensure longer-term service responses on the back of reduced crisis service needs. For example, when a victim survivor from the DEAT’s triage is referred to an aged care provider and a domestic and family violence service provider, the trial sets a platform to initiate and maintain open and frequent communications between police who may have acquired the essential client’s case history and service sector providers who have specialist knowledge of how to best support the client’s needs. This flow of communication and sharing of information may help to break silos of work, enable access to subject matter experts and allow for discussion of approaches to address the client’s needs in a responsive and sustainable manner, reducing the emergence of crisis situations.

(b) Changes for government agencies (QPS and DCDSS):

With regard to QPS and DCDSS, anecdotal evidence from consultations has revealed the mutual positive impacts of the trial through improved capability building, enhanced information sharing and better collaboration. This includes the embedded officer from DCDSS being granted access to the QPS system, as well as the ad hoc information sharing that takes place as a result of colocation.

With QPS specifically, stakeholders noted the positive impacts the DEAT has on capability building, awareness raising, facilitation of the referral process between QPS and service providers, and service responsiveness. This partly resulted from the ease of access to the embedded officer who is co-located at the QPS site and has an understanding about the target cohorts. The DEAT model has demonstrated early signs of success in improving policing responsiveness in multiple ways, including effectively engaging police together with subject matter experts in triage, generating and recording the risk assessment of domestic and family violence on police records, and enhancing police interaction with the service provider network to enable integrated service responses.

Both QPS and DCDSS stakeholders reported that this model has been built upon, and continues to foster, mutual trust and respect between the work of the two agencies, and the skills and experience they each bring to this work.

L.7  Research question four: What are the learnings from the model that can be applied to other models aiming to improve knowledge/awareness of domestic and family violence experiences among people with disability/older people?

There were a number of learnings gleaned from stakeholders reflecting on the experience of the DEAT to date. First, stakeholders believed it is critical to fully embrace and promote the appreciation of human rights when designing a model that addresses the needs of population groups such as

177 QPS. DEAT as of 26 Feb 2019.
people with disability and older people. This understanding should also be communicated to stakeholders as part of the education across the sector. Applied to the DEAT, the concept of human rights has translated into a commitment, shared by leaders of both agencies supporting the trial, to invest in addressing domestic and family violence and achieve equitable outcomes for people living with disability and older people.

The implementation of the DEAT has reiterated the importance of acknowledging the complexity of domestic and family violence matters involving people with disabilities such as mental health conditions, intellectual disabilities, or autism spectrum disorder. For example, where domestic and family violence involves someone with a physical disability or an older person, there may be characteristics (e.g. age) that can help to prompt the identification. However, in some instances the signs may be more subtle, particularly in the context of QPS officers attending shortly after a potentially traumatic event, the person’s response to which may mask an underlying condition. These situations may present QPS staff with a challenge in identifying whether there is a disability experienced by the victims and/or perpetrators, leading to an inability to make referrals in a responsive manner. Although the Gold Coast Taskforce has strived to mitigate the issues (e.g. by conducting reviews of case documents and by consulting with the DCDSS embedded officer to detect any ‘invisible’ sign that can potentially indicate a non-physical disability), this matter may warrant further exploration due to its complex nature.

Between the leading government agencies that support the model, it is important to develop a mutual understanding and trust that will set the foundation for more fluid collaboration. In the DEAT model, toward strengthening the collaborative relationship between QPS and DCDSS, it has been useful to consider exchanging even simple gestures such as inviting partner agencies to co-locate on site or give partner agencies easier accessibility to critical personnel and resources. From stakeholders’ perspectives, these are essential to establish and maintain the trust that is required for collaborative commitments.

Of note, to build effective partnered models, stakeholders believe agencies need to be willing to share risks. Commenting on the complex nature of domestic and family violence matters for people living with disability and older people, stakeholders emphasised the paramount importance of acknowledging the shared responsibility across multiple agencies and sectors that will likely come into contact with the target population at different stages prior to, during, or after the domestic and family violence. In the DEAT, organisations and agencies that have acknowledged the sharing of responsibility include QPS frontline policing, DCDSS, disability support, aged care services and domestic and family violence service providers, and this has been done primarily through the triage and referral process. With a view to preventing or immediately responding to domestic and family violence matters, the responsibility to notify and take ownership of the risks should belong to every partner agency. What it means is that agencies should consider sharing information and raising their concerns as soon as they emerge to allow documenting of evidence that can contribute to depicting clients’ stories and clients’ needs. This will likely lead to better and more comprehensive service responses to prevent or meet the needs of domestic and family violence victim survivors or perpetrators who live with disability and/or are older people.

Another key condition of the early success of the DEAT is the way in which the model has leveraged the existing foundations and processes established by the Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce, and the existing commitment to investing in addressing domestic and family violence in the district. The strong working relationships and processes that have been established across triage agencies, and the case data review function of the Gold Coast Taskforce, has provided the infrastructure for optimising and adapting responses for these cohorts. In considering the learnings of the trial in other locations or contexts, the role of these foundational elements cannot be underestimated. For example, the pre-establishment of a Taskforce and the commitment may be required before progress is made elsewhere toward successful implementation of a model similar to DEAT.

Learnings from the DEAT will be useful to inform the implementation of 'Queensland’s plan to respond to domestic and family violence against people with disability’, released in May 2019. The DEAT may have important working examples across the four focus areas of the plan, namely: raising
L.8 Conclusion

Commencing in November 2018, the DEAT features an initiative between QPS in Gold Coast District and DCDSS. The trial encompasses key components such as appointing an embedded DCDSS officer in QPS or inviting cross-agency subject matter experts to participate in triage, with a view to eliciting integrated service responses for victim survivors and perpetrators who live with disability or fall within the older age bracket.

The trial has seen early evidence of success in improving outcomes for clients by, in particular, delivering more integrated and timely responses. Service providers and government agencies appear to benefit from improved information sharing, capability building to improve awareness of clients' unique needs and experiences and available referral pathways. The key drivers for these outcomes appear to be an embedded officer with content knowledge placed in an existing infrastructure, a focus on relationship building across sectors, and improving sector awareness of referral pathways and the importance of information sharing. It is also essential to build and sustain trust between partner agencies and acknowledge a risk-sharing responsibility that would enable a more preventative and responsive approach to meeting the needs people experiencing or at risk of domestic and family violence.

It will be important to review the lessons learned from the DEAT to inform the implementation of the ‘Queensland’s plan to respond to domestic and family violence against people with disability’.
Appendix M: Keeping Women Safe at Home case study

M.1 Overview of case study

The rollout of the ‘Keeping Women Safe At Home’ project was a trial of new technology to enable women to stay safely in their homes. The Keeping Women Safe in their Homes (KWSITH) initiative comprises three elements: trialling new technologies in four locations; exploring and testing strategies to help keep Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and children safe in their homes and communities; and engaging with industry bodies such as the Real Estate Institute of Queensland to raise awareness, promote understanding of the needs of victims and support the use of new technologies in private rental accommodation.

Only the first element of the KWSITH is included in this case study. A formal evaluation of the technology trial of the KWSITH initiative by the University of NSW is due 2019. The findings from this evaluation will not be available in time for inclusion in the review of the Second Action Plan.

This case study will aim to gain an understanding of the enablers and barriers to effective and safe incorporation of technology solutions to improve safety, including:

- incorporation of technological solutions in safety plans
- operationalising safety plans that include technological solutions
- embedding/sustaining technological solutions through safety planning.

The case study also explores service provider and client perspectives on what is needed to strengthen safety planning to ensure women both feel, and are, safer and the role of technology in this.

M.2 Lines of enquiry

The key research questions for this case study were formulated following a consultation with DPC and DCSYW. These are aligned to the evaluation framework (supporting outcome five) to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- Process question one: Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?
- Supporting outcome five: To what extent are victims and their families safe and supported?

The overarching research questions include:

1. What progress has been made in increasing awareness and knowledge about technological solutions and the use of technology in violence against women?
2. What have been the enablers and barriers?
3. What are key strategies or opportunities for future consideration to overcome identified barriers?
4. What are the service providers and clients’ perspectives on what is needed to strengthen safety planning to ensure women both feel, and are, safer?

M.3 Data sources

The data sources for this case study, include:
- Two by one hour in-depth interviews with service providers in Caboolture and Ipswich
- One and a half hour focus group with implementing agencies
- Non-identifying trial documentation.

M.4 About KWSITH

In September 2015, the Commonwealth Government announced a $100 million package of measures to provide a safety net for women and children at high risk of experiencing violence. The package sought to address domestic and family violence nationally through a Women’s Safety Program, with investment to improve frontline support and services, leverage innovative
technologies to keep women safe and provide education resources to help change community attitudes to violence and abuse.

The Queensland Government, through the Department of Child Safety Youth and Women was successful in securing funding to trial several projects under the KWSITH investment. The Queensland KWSITH initiative comprises three elements:

- trialling new technologies as part of the department’s existing domestic and family violence home security safety upgrades initiative in four locations
  - **Personal Duress Alarms (PDA)** – 24/7 security monitored back-to-base monitoring service with a high-risk alert activation communicated promptly to Queensland Police Service (QPS)-000. Home security and personal alarms offer a promising security-based response for reducing domestic violence in a way that empowers victims and provides tangible and immediate protection. Personal alarms are tangible tools that support personal safety and help manage the everyday circumstances of people's lives: their home and work, education, shopping and recreation. Mobile personal duress alarms stand out in terms of all-round security. Support a security-based approach to reducing repeat offending over the long-term, and the one that gives greatest control to women.
  - **CCTV self-monitored (CS)** - Visual deterrence to perpetrators and provides evidence of real reductions in threatening behaviour and reoffending, these interventions appear to contribute to enormous improvements in feelings of safety, providing a sense of control in reducing or eliminating psychological stress and fear.
  - **Dash Cams (CS)** - Evidence collection of stalking can be collected and used to apply for a DVO or as evidence of non-compliance with an existing order.
  - **Information Safety Applications (APPS)** – Re-focus is a free, easy to use and interactive app for women who are thinking of separating. It covers legal information about domestic violence, arrangements for children, financial and property matters, options for reaching a legal agreement and safe accommodation. It also provides helpful referrals and coping tips about separation. Penda is a free app that combines financial tips, legal information and referrals for women who have experienced domestic and family violence. Sunny is 1800RESPECT's app for women with disability who have experienced violence and abuse. Sunny has been co-designed with women with disability to make sure it provides the best support for the people who use it. Witnessed - evidence collection application used mainly for recording.
  - **Emergency safety apps (APP)** - generally fall into 2 categories: 1) services that notify a select group of individuals that you have an emergency, and 2) services that notify emergency responders – security monitoring centres that you need help. There are benefits and limitations of emergency safety apps, but more thought is required before implementing an emergency safety app as part of a safety plan.
  - **IT/Cyber Audits** – Engage professionals through security monitoring companies, IT firms with a specific understanding or capacity to gain an understanding of domestic and family violence. Opportunity to have Property Safety Audits will be conducted by specialist “Property Safety Officers” who hold qualifications Level 4 in Security Operations.
  - **Cyber Education** - Simple education - Keeping Safe online - passwords, Social Media, Online abuse
  - **Professional development** - WESNET Conference has been attended by the Queensland domestic and family violence service sector, QPS, and domestic and family violence shelters. This Technology Safety Summit brings together experts who are leading the world in addressing the intersection of domestic violence and technology. This conference is for professionals working with domestic violence survivors who is also experiencing technology facilitated abuse. Attendees gain a deeper understanding of how perpetrators misuse technology to abuse and stalk and how they can support survivors of abuse, such as:
    - Common technologies that perpetrators use, such as phones, location tracking and social media.
    - Research on mobile spyware.
• Innovative use of technology, such as mobile safety apps.
• Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Culturally and Linguistically Diverse survivors of technology-facilitated abuse. Deva Chat - gossip social media
• Office of the E-Safety Commissioner's online portal for image-based abuse.

commissioning research to explore and test home security safety upgrades strategies to help keep Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and children safe in their homes and communities
  o DCSYW commissioned research in three remote Queensland communities to learn what other safety strategies these communities may have in place, what seems to be fuelling family or domestic violence in these communities, what other supports are available to community members at risk, what support might be missing and ideally, what types of interventions under the Women’s Safety Package funding could help to make communities safer.
• the OFWDVR will engage with industry bodies such as the Real Estate Institute of Queensland to raise awareness of domestic and family violence, promote understanding of the needs of victims and support the use of new technologies to help keep women safe when they reside in private rental accommodation.

Four locations were selected to trial innovative safe at home technologies to support women and their families to remain in their homes where it is safe to do so. The suppliers in each of these locations are existing suppliers of home security safety upgrades which includes installations such as lights, locks and security screens. The four KWSITH Technology Trial sites – Cairns, Rockhampton, Ipswich and Caboolture – were selected based on existing supplier profiles including prevalence of domestic and family violence, experience and expertise. Two of these sites, Caboolture and Ipswich participated in this case study. The key components of the KWSITH Technology Trial include:

• Comprehensive risk assessments, safety planning, safety audits (property and cyber environments) and assessing cultural risk as part of a coordinated case management plan
• Referral pathways to counselling and other identified support services
• Use of existing funding under the Investment Strategy - T320 Domestic Violence brokerage\(^{178}\) for appropriate property identification; key and lock upgrades to doors and windows and security lighting and doors if required
• Practical and emotional support through the referral pathways by the support worker

The funding enhancement to existing service suppliers will complement the existing service delivery to trial emerging technologies such as:

• Personal duress alarms (PDAs)
• Home Security Cameras (SC) linked to recording devices/smart phones/cloud services/surveillance
• Smart phone technology applications (MyWitness, Guardian Duress Alarm or as negotiated with the domestic and family violence program area)
• The use of IT consultants to complete audits on the clients’ existing technology and promote cyber safety.

M.5  Research question one: What progress has been made increasing awareness and knowledge about technological solutions and the use of technology in violence against women

Prior to the KWSITH Technology Trial, stakeholders reported they were aware that technology facilitated abuse such as surveillance, stalking, social media, phone - texting, calls, tracking devices was occurring. Training service providers in what to ask and how to detect devices in use helped to identify when technology abuse occurred. Stakeholders reported that participating in the KWSITH Technology Trial made them realise how much the sector did not know and it really raised

---

awareness of the need for more education around technology-facilitated abuse for specialist domestic and family violence services who had limited knowledge about how to detect, or if identified, how to address this in safety planning. The rapid pace of technological advances, decreasing cost and accessibility of technology for abusers means stakeholders felt there was a role for ongoing education to ensure that specialist domestic and family violence services were up to date and knowledgeable about what is out on the market and how it can be used to both abuse and protect victims.

As a result of the KWSITH Technology Trial, there has been an increase in the presence of technology-related information on specialist domestic and family violence service websites, including the Centre Against Domestic Abuse and Domestic Violence and the Domestic Violence Action Centre. Most information and updates have been collated from the work of WESNET and E-Safety Commissioner. The Queensland Government website also reflects technology safety planning and provides links and information for the sector and victim survivors.

M.6 Research question two: What have been the enablers and barriers?

Enablers

Collaboration between DCSYW and QPS is an important enabler. These emerged through workshops to develop a common understanding of the trial. The strong relationships occurred at several levels. Central office and the project officer established relationships with QPS Headquarters and stakeholders built relationships with QPS locally.

The strong relationships were important to establish trust to support information sharing between trial providers about implementation issues. This was particularly important in this context given the rapid pace of technological advancements. For example, a community of practice among the trial participants facilitated shared information and created a forum for working together on common issues and concerns. An initial implementation meeting to identify the knowledge base among the trial sites was used to design guidelines, and draw in the appropriate specialists in security and devices.

Capacity building was also an enabler that assisted in increasing knowledge and confidence in technology-facilitated abuse and how technology could be used for safety planning. For example, stakeholders identified that workforce capacity building through WESNET was beneficial for service providers to increase their knowledge and expertise required for the constantly changing technology-based abuse. Training delivered by WESNET was delivered to the domestic and family violence sector and police beyond the trial sites. This highlighted the need for ongoing professional development in this area, recognising it is a growing part of their work. The DCSYW are looking for strategies and opportunities to increase knowledge and for technology experts to support service providers to enable them to continue to focus on specialist domestic and family violence support, case management and risk management.

Building confidence in the use of technology takes time. For example, it was important for the domestic and family violence specialist services to allow time to complete the training on devices with clients, to ensure they were confident in how to use them. Time was also required to have in-depth conversations with client about the options available to them, to educate them and inform them about the technology.

Optimal conditions for success included a centrally administered program, a dedicated coordinator, and involvement of all stakeholder groups (including police and private security) within a risk-based system that gives maximum control to women.

Barriers

The biggest barrier was the **ever-changing nature of technology making it difficult to identify technology-based abuse**. Once detected it could be dangerous to remove immediately as doing so could alert the perpetrator and potentially put the client at risk. In addition, perpetrators could upgrade device or software once alerted to detection, making it a constant process of scanning and learning about the increasingly diverse range of products available. And lastly, whilst detection of some type of surveillance was known, what or how the surveillance was occurring was not always able to be discovered. To keep safe, clients needed to find a way to live with a level of invasion (turning devices off; getting new devices; selling a device; using another car; or covering up webcams; moving furniture over locations with cameras; not talking in certain rooms etc.) until either enough product research was done to aid discovery; the device was discovered; or their products were reviewed and secured to ensure effective removal of the offending product.

A lack of knowledge and understanding on how to effectively and confidently use technology also prevented the effectiveness of the KWSITH Technology Trial. For example, clients often had low levels of knowledge regarding technology facilitated abuse.

**Client preferences and capacity** also determined whether technology features were taken up. For example, stakeholders reported clients may have a preference not to use devices, or may not know how to use them. Other victim survivors, particularly those who are regionally-based, may have a preference to relocate rather than staying in their current accommodation with increased technology.

Service providers also needed to exercise professional judgement on when to use it. They reported that for some clients it might give confidence leading to complacency following other elements of the safety plan, while for others they may become obsessive and hyper vigilant by looking at monitors, which in turn could increase their anxiety.

A further barrier to implementation was **maintaining contact with clients**. This cohort of clients move regularly, change address or change phone numbers making the ability to recontact difficult over time. The trial assumed that clients would have PDAs for a fairly short time of three to six months. However, clients held onto devices for a year or longer, and were reluctant to hand them back. This meant there were a lot of devices that could not be reused in the trial. Over a longer period, it was difficult to maintain contact with a client (clients may have stopped communicating with the service provider or moved). Service providers reported this made it difficult to know if devices were still in use, if they had been lost, or if the victim survivor had moved to another home.

There were also **supply-side challenges**. Security Monitoring Companies and technology installation suppliers were limited in the market and had limited knowledge of domestic and family violence and how to service clients who may be traumatised. A predominately male workforce, many suppliers had no domestic and family violence training, and no way of screening workers to see if they had a DVO, or assessing their ability to work with vulnerable women. Contractors are not equipped to respond appropriately when victim survivors shared certain information. Conversely, some contractors would share information with clients directly about the “security risks” and scare them unnecessarily and heighten their anxiety. Technology installation services were selected by individual domestic and family violence services and their own screening processes. PDA devices were limited in the market, however for security companies, the DCSYW needed to ensure any device selected for the trial had security monitoring that had attained minimum Grade A1 security ratings.

There were constraints with private rentals and social housing, specifically gaining approval to install CCTV due to privacy issues in housing complexities (for example, other tenants privacy would be invaded if cameras were on common areas), while others demanded more rent as the property was enhanced with security (example: the property was now a higher standard with security so they landlord would want to put the rent up).

Other practical challenges included:

- Keeping devices charged
- Constraints with private rentals and social housing
- Lack of uniform legislation across Australia or in Queensland that addresses the use of technology-facilitated violence, and it is still a developing area of the law
M.7  Research question three: What are key strategies or opportunities for future consideration to overcome identified barriers?

A range of strategies were used to overcome these barriers including:

- Emailing and sending SMS messages to a list of approximately 120 clients with low or no signal over a six-month period, to remind them to recharge devices, to overcome barriers to PDAs losing charge not being effective
- Using solar powered CCTV devices to reduce the cost of replacing batteries and forgetting to replace batteries.

Service providers tried to educate contractors on how to work with victim survivors and how domestic and family violence impacts women and children. Strategies were implemented where support workers would talk directly to the contractor and be present at installation.

Service providers showed that appropriate safety planning and tailored allocation of devices to suit individual need overcame limitations to either the client’s capacity or context. For example, a visually impaired women used a sound alert monitor rather than a video monitor to identify if the perimeter of her property was being compromised; an elderly lady used a basic phone rather than a smart phone; and a woman with an intellectual disability was supplied a PDA with three large buttons, which all raised an alert.

Other key opportunities to overcome the barrier identified included:

- Streamlined administration practices, improve brokerage flexibility and include a range of technology options
- Professional development of specialised domestic and family violence services and support workers
- Improved sector awareness of technology-based abuse
- More time to engage contractors and need to encourage technology specialists to have domestic and family violence support skills and consider domestic and family violence applications of their products

M.8  Research question four: What are the service providers and clients’ perspectives on what is needed to strengthen safety planning to ensure women both feel, and are, safer?

Findings on what works to make women feel and be safer

This section should be interpreted cautiously, recognising it reflects the views of a limited number of stakeholders. Stakeholders believe that the use of technology is most effective at strengthening safety planning when it:

- Raises the sense of security and empowers women to take back control of their lives or have the confidence to get on with their lives
- Increases self-agency and help seeking through apps and websites which link victims with service providers, support groups, and improve victims’ access to justice
- Gives victim survivors in remote areas greater access to services online
- Helps victim survivors stay more connected with friends and family, combating abusers’ attempts to isolate them
- Alerts victim survivors of an approaching abuser, so they can act to alert police.

Stakeholders reported the KWSITH Technology Trial contributed to improved feelings of safety and wellbeing and reduced stress. Evidence from Client Feedback Questionnaires identifies that approximately 89% of women issued with a PDA feel an increased sense of safety and wellbeing for them and their children. There are decreases in the level of fear, which improves their level of physical health and emotional wellbeing. Anecdotally, the CCTV is said to have decreased the number of property breaches. Having CCTV gave women a lens to the outside to safely assess the situation, similarly reportedly contributing to reduced stress and improvements to their emotional wellbeing.
A further benefit was that victim survivors felt believed and could provide evidence. Surveillance video is often undeniable evidence when used to prove guilt in a court of law. Stakeholders commented that even if this is not used in the courts, it has greatly increased the confidence of victim survivors who often feel that they are not believed. This increased confidence can contribute to reduced anxiety and feelings of stigmatisation and stress. Similarly, recorded evidence from PDAs have been used as evidence in court.

There were elements of the trial and solution that enabled women to be more in control of their safety planning. Service providers reported the trial enabled them to better understand risk (i.e. when and where stalking was occurring) and apply better plans to minimise this risk. The use of brokerage enabled victim survivors to drive their safety planning, something considered important as often they will best know what will work to keep them safe. Brokerage in the KWSITH Trial provided better options for clients that incorporated a range of technological solutions (PDAs, CCTVs, Apps etc.) than the brokerage that does not cover these items.

**Future opportunities to strengthen safety planning**

The portability and expansion of the 'Safe at Home' program needs:

- Consistent and coordinated approaches with centralised top down cross agency relationships and strong local ground up stakeholder networks.
- A step-down device solution to transition clients when they are no longer vulnerable so that PDAs can be repurposed, and the program is more efficient.
- Solutions need to consider the transient nature of the client base and ensure that there are ways to manage contact, engagement and monitoring appropriately that may provide a better support to clients to be less reliant on maintaining ongoing contact with a domestic and family violence service.

**Increased awareness in the housing sector** is needed to facilitate support of CCTV installations on property. While public housing is obtained through DHPW and community housing associations, a significant proportion of victim survivors of domestic and family violence are housed through the private rental market. Private landlords need to be approached to gain permission for property alterations etc., prior to any security upgrades to property such as the installation of security lights and/or CCTV cameras. Private landlords are concerned about potential damage to property, and this is a sensitive negotiation period as victim survivors may be evicted at this point, or rental agreements not renewed. It has also been reported some victim survivors are asked to leave private rental accommodation following security upgrades (e.g. new security screens) to enable the landlord to raise the rent on the basis of the security enhancements to the property. Where the property owner includes the perpetrator on the lease there has been incidents of disrupting or stopping contractors making the installations.

**It is important that victim survivors are provided with the information to understand that staying at home may be a genuine option and that sufficient supports are available for those who decide to remain at home or return there.** However this decision also needs to recognise that technologies are one component of a more comprehensive safety plan. Evaluations show that Safe at Home programs can be effective. The University of NSW is undertaking an evaluation of the KWSITH Technology Trial. There will be an opportunity to use this evidence, when available, to inform funding and policy decisions that support the use of technology in safety planning and improve the sector’s response to technology-based abuse.

**Opportunities to better integrate technology into current domestic and family violence responses and home security safety upgrades.** There are no universal guidelines or principles for Safe at Home programs, and the design and implementation of the programs has been inconsistent nationally. The primary features of effective Safe at Home programs are accompanying support, confidence in police and court responses, and the use of security technology. An integrated
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system is needed to keep women safe. This shows there is a need for a broader approach to safety planning that includes new technologies.

**More innovation to use technology to combat technology-based abuse.** There are many technology solutions available in the market that have the potential to be adapted for to prevent domestic and family violence.

**M.9 Conclusion**

The KWSITH Technology Trial appears to have improved understanding of the scale and breadth of technology-facilitated abuse. Education has been an important component of the trial to support better outcomes. This includes education to clients and service providers on technology solutions available to build confidence in their use.

Consultations and Client Feedback Questionnaires indicate technology solutions can contribute to improved feelings of safety, and confidence victim survivors will be believed because they will be able to show police video, pictures, electronic traces or other hard evidence of perpetrator behaviour. It will be important to consider how clients and service providers can continue to keep updated on technology advancements, including to detect technology-facilitated abuse, and to overcome supply-side barriers pertaining to the private rental market and capacity of contractors, as well as managing risk.
Appendix N: Perpetrator program case study

N.1 Overview of case study
Rather than focusing on a specific action, the scope of this case study is government funded perpetrator program responses, seeking to capture the scope and scale of current provision of government-funded perpetrator programs in Queensland, where gaps exist, and enablers and barriers to these interventions. This may include services and programs funded under the Strategy, as well as those resourced through other means; privately funded interventions and programs are out of scope. Broader system responses to perpetrators, such as police and courts, are not in scope.

The scope of this case study is aligned with supporting outcome six in the Second Action Plan: 
Perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account.

N.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following a consultation with DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Process question one:** Has the Second Action Plan been delivered as intended?
- **Outcome question six:** To what extent have perpetrators stopped using violence and are they held to account? (supporting outcome six – immediate outcomes 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5)

The key questions include:

1. What is the current scope and scale of government-funded perpetrator interventions being delivered in Queensland?
2. Where are the key gaps in the perpetrator intervention response? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?
3. What progress has been made in collaborating and coordinating responses across the settings in which perpetrator interventions are delivered?
4. What are the barriers to and facilitators of the perpetrator intervention response in Queensland? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?
5. What are some of the barriers for perpetrators accessing services or interventions? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?
6. What are the barriers to and facilitators of victim safety being realised from perpetrators using these services or interventions? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?
7. What are the future opportunities to contribute to supporting outcome six, i.e. perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account?

N.3 Data sources
The following primary and secondary data sources were used to inform this case study:

- Consultations with the Queensland government departments and agencies, specifically: DCSYW, the Courts Innovation Program (CIP) at DJAG, and the Queensland Corrective Services (QCS).
- Stakeholders in the town and community of Cherbourg including:
  - Graham House
  - Probation and Parole
  - The Muran Djan Centre
  - Mr Don Murray
• Secondary data relevant to ascertaining the current scope and scale of government-funded perpetrator program responses delivered in Queensland was also collected from DCSYW:
  – Approved provider and approved intervention programs list (current at March 2018)
  – Journey to Intervention Programs, Workshop Report (Draft)
  – Aggregate results from perpetrator consultation pre Innovation Workshop.
• De-identified post-program survey results from Woodford and Maryborough correctional centres from the first cohort of participants in the trial men’s behaviour change program.

Results from the DCSYW sector survey were not available at the time of writing.

N.4 Overview of the action
Perpetrator interventions are being increasingly recognised as an important and growing component of the overall service response that can be used to prevent domestic violence, and minimise and abate its negative effects on victim survivors, families and society.

In response to a number of relevant recommendations in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, the Second Action Plan allocated $10.3 million181 for perpetrator interventions to prevent further violence, with a particular focus on increasing accountability. Actions regarding perpetrator interventions in the Second Action Plan included:

• Pilot of a new intervention model for fathers who expose their children to domestic and family violence in Mount Isa, Sunshine Coast and Moreton Bay areas.
• Expand the number of perpetrator intervention services to increase their capacity to respond to more perpetrators, and engage new services where there are identified gaps (including where HRTs are being rolled out as part of an integrated service response to domestic and family violence).
• Review and update the Professional Practice Standards: Working with men who perpetrate domestic and family violence, broadening the scope to include individual counselling, culturally appropriate approaches to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients, young offenders and provision of information to respondents appearing at court.
• Develop a quality assurance framework and audit process to ensure ongoing compliance with the Professional Practice Standards for working with perpetrators of domestic and family violence.

DJAG was the lead agency for these actions. Under the Courts Innovation Program work with CJGs, some CJGs identified perpetrator responses as the area of focus for their community.

Where relevant, this case study also takes into account government funded perpetrator-related agency or service activities beyond the strict scope and funding provisions of the Strategy and Second Action Plan; an example of this is the men’s behaviour change trial that has commenced in three QCS centres.

Other actions relating to perpetrator accountability included a new offence of strangulation in a domestic setting, specific notation on a person’s criminal history for domestic violence offences, and increased maximum penalties for perpetrators.

Research question one: What is the current scope and scale of government-funded perpetrator interventions being delivered in Queensland?

Perpetrator behaviour change interventions currently being delivered in Queensland differ by characteristics such as format, delivery setting and target cohort; these are summarised in Table N.1.

As shown in Table N.1, perpetrators may access behaviour change interventions in different settings or via different referrals. Some perpetrators may be mandated to attend a behaviour change program as a condition of their probation or parole; other perpetrators may be recommended (but not mandated) to participate in a behaviour change program when a DVO is issued and an intervention order is made; the perpetrator may also self-refer. These intervention programs are funded by DCSYW, and delivered by a number of non-government organisations across Queensland.

QCS has recently commenced a trial of a domestic and family violence-specific behaviour change program in three correctional facilities. Prior to the commencement of the trial, behaviour change programs specific to domestic and family violence were not available in correctional centres. Perpetrators had access to more general programs, as well as those targeting sexual violence in some centres.

Table N.1 Overview of perpetrator interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of intervention</th>
<th>Perpetrator cohort</th>
<th>Current scope and scale</th>
<th>Funding agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Behaviour change program Delivered in community settings | Majority male:  
  - Intervention orders  
  - Self-referral  
  - Mandated (probation and parole) | 25 approved intervention programs in Queensland:  
  - 22 group programs for men only  
  - 1 group program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men only  
  - 2 individual counselling only  
  - 1 individual counselling for men and women | DCSYW |
| Behaviour change program Delivered in correctional centres | Male perpetrators:  
  - Self-referral | Group intervention program for men only  
  3 trial correctional centres:  
  - Woodford  
  - Wolston  
  - Maryborough | QCS |
| Community-based supplementary responses | Male perpetrators | Supplementary responses include supports provided to perpetrators in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and their communities, which may involve facilitating access to behaviour change programs provided by DCSYW, or providing culturally appropriate support to supplement other interventions. Seven CJGs are in the process of designing and implementing responses, including supplementary perpetrator responses. These are part of a wider response to support victims and families. | DJAG via CJGs |
Male and female perpetrators

Information, advice, referral, counselling and support services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people using violence in their relationships.

Perpetrator services part of overarching domestic and family violence services provided to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, men, children and young people experiencing (or at risk of experiencing) domestic and family violence in 11 communities:

- Cooktown and surrounding communities
- Thursday Island
- Northern Peninsula Area in Cape York
- Weipa
- Pormpuraaw
- Mount Isa including support to Doomadgee, Normanton and Cloncurry
- Townsville
- Palm Island
- Rockhampton including support to Woorabinda
- Cunnamulla
- Cherbourg

Source: Deloitte Access Economics consultations with implementing agencies and secondary information supplied by DCSYW and DJAG

DCSYW-funded intervention programs provided by 14 non-government service providers, delivered in 29 locations:

- Brisbane (4)
- Townsville
- Mount Isa
- Rockhampton (2)
- Yeppoon
- Woorabinda
- Gold Coast (5)
- Hervey Bay (2)
- Maryborough (2)
- Cairns
- Yarrabah
- Innisfail
- Port Douglas
- Logan
- Beenleigh
- Cleveland
- Capalaba
- Ipswich
- Bundaberg (2)
- Gympie
- Sunshine Coast (2)
- Mackay
- Caboolture
- Redcliffe

- Pine Rivers
- Murgon
- Cherbourg
- Toowoomba/Darling Downs
- Moranbah / Isaac Regional Council
Research question two: Where are the key gaps in the perpetrator intervention response? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?

Perpetrator interventions across Queensland can be assessed by type, delivery setting and cohort. Two key dynamics related to these criteria emerged from consultations with stakeholders: scale and scope of interventions.

Scale of interventions

In terms of scale, stakeholders flagged a general undersupply of perpetrator focused interventions. While it was acknowledged by stakeholders that victim supports are crucial, the role of perpetrator interventions in preventing violence and keeping women safe was seen as paramount.

Some programs funded by DCSYW delivered in the community are experiencing long wait times. In addition, it was noted that those perpetrators who are mandated to attend a program can often be prioritised, exacerbating delays to access for self-referring participants. Delays in access are likely to be an indication that demand for such programs exceeds supply. This is despite the additional funding allocated as part of the Second Action Plan to extend these services. It was also noted that access for people living in remote areas can be limited due to requirements to attend face-to-face group programs on a regular basis, posing logistical challenges such as transport.

In the correctional centre setting, as noted in Table N.1, only recently has access to a domestic and family violence specific behaviour change program been made available via a trial in three centres. This trial addresses the identified need to provide tailored intervention for perpetrators of domestic and family violence, recognising the drivers of violence in this context can be very different to other criminal activity and violence. The trial does not include prisoners on remand, with stakeholders noting the practical barriers with programs for this cohort when sentencing dates are often unknown.

Scope of interventions

In terms of scope, a number of gaps were noted by stakeholders; these pertain to perpetrator cohort, as well as the nature of interventions.

For **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander** perpetrators, there is only one intervention program that is specifically funded by DCSYW for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men; however, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men are not precluded from accessing other general intervention programs, and also have access to other supports and services as part of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander domestic and family violence services.

Few traditional programmatic men’s behaviour change programs have been tested and shown to be effective in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cohorts. It was noted by stakeholders that the nature of violence in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families and communities requires a unique response both from a content and practical perspective. The nature of healing and respect in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families requires a tailored response. There have been some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men accessing the program in the correctional centres trial; program delivery personnel indicated that whilst the program is not specific for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders participants, there was flexibility in the way it was delivered to allow participants to still reflect on their own culture and values. The remoteness and size of many communities can also prohibit access to group programs because of practical considerations and privacy concerns. These types of gaps have been identified by some CJGs, and are being minimised using various solutions that have been co-designed with the support of the Courts Innovation Program team at DJAG.

There are no programs funded specifically for **LGBTIQ** perpetrators. While this cohort may not necessarily be precluded from participating in general programs, some stakeholders indicated it was not appropriate to combine these perpetrators with male perpetrators who have been using violence against women. This was in consideration of the gender mix within groups, and the gendered nature of violence in these contexts. Consultation indicated that content of behaviour change programs tended to be quite heterosexual and gender normative in nature. Program delivery personnel indicated that it was important to be aware of the circumstances of perpetrators to ensure content...
delivered is sensitive and appropriate for individuals’ circumstances of using violence, for example a male perpetrator who may have been using violence in a relationship with a transgender woman.

It was also reported that because of these issues, reaching the minimum number of participants to conduct group programs with participants in similar circumstance could be difficult, particularly in less densely populated areas. As such, one-on-one counselling is often provided as an alternative to the group program setting; this was acknowledged as better than not providing any intervention, however these participants did not get exposure to the group discussion and peer reflection element of the group programs.

There are also no programs specifically funded for perpetrators from CALD backgrounds. While they are not precluded from participating in the existing services provided, there are likely to be language and cultural barriers that may limit the applicability of these options. Similar challenges with reaching minimum participant numbers to facilitate group programs may also be relevant in this cohort.

Perpetrators with disability are another cohort not specifically catered to within the current provision of programs. Intellectual disability or cognitive impairment is likely to require a specialised approach, with a group program model potentially unsuitable for these perpetrators.

Interventions for female perpetrators was also identified as a gap by stakeholders. While it is acknowledged that this cohort is much smaller than the male cohort, there was an opportunity identified to provide interventions for women in correctional centres. It was noted that this response would need to be tailored to female perpetrators, noting that they are commonly also victim survivors.

While the aforementioned gaps are mostly related to programmatic responses, it was also cited by stakeholders that another gap is the availability of a spectrum of interim interventions and other supports more generally, for example services or supports that may be made available while perpetrators are awaiting access to group programs; this is discussed further in research question 7 (section N.11).

Research question three: What progress has been made in collaborating and coordinating responses across the settings in which perpetrator interventions are delivered?

Progress is being made in collaboration and coordination, observed at the agency level, as well as the service provider level.

Examples at the agency level include collaboration between QCS and DCSYW on trial programs being delivered in correctional centres and innovation workshops delivered by DCSYW.

Interagency collaboration was reported in the context of the working group that has been established to oversee the trial of men’s behaviour change programs in correctional centres. This working group includes representation from QCS as the lead agency as well as DCSYW. It was noted that the experience of DSCYW in funding programs in the community setting has been an important input into the design and delivery of this trial to date.

Broader collaboration between government agencies and the sector is evident in the innovation workshops that DSCYW facilitated. DCSYW delivered two workshops in 2018 to identify innovative ways to engage with perpetrators while they wait to access a behaviour change program. The purpose of the workshops was to “assist in developing an approach to make the best use of the waiting time before an intervention program to support perpetrators’ behavioural change.”182 This focus aligns with the gaps to perpetrator behavioural change and victim safety presented by under-provision of these services and the associated long wait lists.

The workshop featured both government and non-government participants (see Table N.2), acknowledging the complexity of this challenge and demonstrating a deliberate effort to coordinate and collaborate between government and the sector to identify solutions. It generated a number of ideas designed to support perpetrator interventions and ways to engage perpetrators and manage
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182 Journey to Intervention Programs, Workshop Report (Draft)
risk while they are waiting to attend a men’s behaviour change program, discussed further in research question seven.

Table N.2 Innovation workshop participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Non-government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCSYW</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Prevention Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCS (Probation and Parole)</td>
<td>Mensline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DVConnect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micah Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Domestic Violence Services Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services and Practitioners for the Elimination of Abuse Queensland (SPEAQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth and Family Service (YFS) – Logan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCSYW - Journey to Perpetrator Intervention Programs: Workshop report

Stakeholders also highlighted some examples of collaboration and coordination at the service provision level. The collaboration between the CJGs and service providers in communities is an example of a coordinated response. A number of CJGs have identified perpetrator needs as a focus area for their activities under the Second Action Plan. Although CJGs are not responsible for delivering specific perpetrator programs, they are instrumental in the coordination of the perpetrator intervention landscape, and in holding perpetrators to account for their actions.

The CJG-based domestic and family violence supplementary responses have been designed by CJGs with the support of the CIP team (DJAG). These responses are unique to each community and seek to enhance support for perpetrators through different mechanisms. An example of a coordinated response is the CJG in Cherbourg establishing a ‘men’s hub’, the Muran Djan centre. This response was developed by the CJG in collaboration with the service providers in the community and other community members. It was noted there was a significant level of community input involved, including local men helping to clean up and paint the building, instilling a sense of pride and ownership. The hub was established to address cultural and logistical challenges with male perpetrator engagement with men’s behaviour change group programs in Murgon. The hub is a place for men to attend probation and parole appointments on a designated day each week, with other services such as the men’s behaviour change counsellor, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service (ATSILS) re-integration program, CREST program, mental health and alcohol and other drugs counselling, in one place on one day.

This coordination between the local providers has reportedly improved adherence to behaviour change interventions and access to services; the CREST worker noted that there had not been any men declining to participate in behaviour change interventions since they had been provided at the Muran Djan centre. The centre also addresses privacy and safety issues that arose from perpetrators attending multiple sites within the community and surrounds to meet their probation and parole requirements (i.e. court house for probation and parole, Cherbourg hospital for mental health and alcohol and other drugs services and Murgon for weekly attendance at behaviour change program).

A men’s hub has also been established by the CJG in Mossman. The support and services it delivers are tailored to the specific needs of that community. Some communities have also been engaging perpetrators and delivering perpetrator-based responses and supports voluntarily, such as in Wujal Wujal.

On a broader scale, the specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court located in Southport, which deals exclusively with civil and criminal domestic and family violence matters, was highlighted by
some stakeholders as key marker of progress, including in terms of holistic approaches that take into account the perpetrator-focused elements of addressing domestic and family violence.

With victim survivor and family safety being the priority objective of High Risk Teams (HRTs), some stakeholders cited there may also be opportunity for increased coordination of perpetrator program interventions through this forum as a mechanism to contribute to this objective. This is in addition to the existing perpetrator-focused mechanisms of HRTs through policing, courts and probation and parole responses.

N.8 Research question four: What are the barriers to and facilitators of the perpetrator intervention response in Queensland? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?

Stakeholders identified a number of barriers to the perpetrator intervention response in Queensland. There were fewer facilitators cited of the perpetrator intervention response as a whole, and mostly at this stage related to the funding that was allocated to expand the scale of current services. Facilitators to access and facilitators to contributing to victim survivor safety are discussed in section N.9 and section N.10, respectively.

Barriers

It is noted that there has been a strong focus on victim survivor support and responses in recent reforms. Stakeholders agreed that victim survivor safety is the priority, and perpetrator responses and interventions are critical to achieve that. Given that perpetrators often use violence repeatedly in subsequent relationships, focusing on perpetrators has the potential to minimise or avoid violence against multiple victim survivors. As such, there was a general sentiment that more could be done to address the underlying features and other conditions that lead to perpetrators using violence; behaviour change programs are one component of the response.

There appears to be a scarcity of evidence regarding the extent to which behaviour change programs affect long-term change in behaviour. Stakeholders from DCSYW cited that, as such, there is variation in the nature and quality of programs being delivered within the government-funded sector. The review of the Professional Practice Standards, and the development of an accompanying quality assurance framework, seeks to establish a standard of service provision to monitor and optimise the effectiveness of perpetrator interventions. These are yet to be finalised and implemented.

Regarding the current delivery of perpetrator interventions, other barriers cited include the voluntary nature of perpetrator interventions in the civil system. This was largely couched around stakeholders having limited powers to compel perpetrators to attend programs, as well as no scope to sanction against non-attendance. Stakeholders participating in the innovation workshops hosted by DCSYW (see section N.7) also highlighted a number of other barriers encountered in the civil system, especially when compared to those perpetrators mandated to attend through criminal proceedings.

One key barrier related to the difference for those accessing programs and interventions voluntarily, is the lack of case management and system oversight for these perpetrators. It was noted that, in the instance of delays in access, this cohort can have little to no exposure to the service system. This poses a potential safety risk for reoffending or breaching orders, and also was seen to be a missed opportunity to intervene at the time a perpetrator has agreed to participate in a behaviour change program. Case management and adjunct service responses are discussed further in section N.10 (research question six).

In the context of court-ordered participation, some stakeholders noted that probation and parole reporting periods post release can be shorter than the duration of a behaviour change program. This limits the effectiveness of an intervention in this context, as there may be little obligation to continue participating following the reporting period. Stakeholders indicated that in some instances, access to behaviour change programs in regional and remote areas will dictate whether participation is incorporated into conditions of probation and parole. This suggests that feasibility can potentially take precedence over risk or need for intervention at times.
For perpetrators accessing interventions in correctional centres, it was also cited that the effectiveness of behaviour change programs was limited by the extent to which messages are reinforced by other personnel within the centres. Stakeholders consulted highlighted that the behaviour change program is a good first step, but the confined environment of correctional centres and interactions with other prisoners and staff can inhibit the impact of the program content. A shift in culture was seen to be required to keep prisoners to account in terms of not tolerating language and other behaviour that contradict what is taught in the programs.

As noted in research question two, the limited extent of interventions that are appropriate for perpetrators who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, from CALD backgrounds, LGBTIQ, female and/or have a disability, is a barrier to achieving change in these cohorts. Responses for young people being exposed to violence and starting to exhibit signs of violent behaviours was another cohort cited. It was acknowledged that more could be done to break the cycle of intergenerational violence that can manifest in some circumstances.

Workforce was cited as an emerging issue in the provision of appropriate perpetrator interventions. DCSYW acknowledged that, while an increased supply of programs could be beneficial in reducing wait time and improving access, this would be limited by the supply of an appropriately skilled workforce. A number of stakeholders discussed domestic and family violence as an issue that has increased in prominence over the last few years and, as such, there is a lag with supply of the workforce. In particular, the requirement for a male and female facilitator (that will be articulated in the Professional Practice Standards) may also raise workforce issues. Risk of burnout was also raised in instances where participants are particularly resistant or not willing or ready to legimately engage in the program and change their behaviour; one stakeholder noted this may be more pronounced for female facilitators needing to continually challenge attitudes of participants as part of the program.

In rural and remote communities, there was some reliance on fly-in, fly-out (FIFO) resources, posing particular challenges in establishing continuity, permanence, and consistency of experience for perpetrators in various types of interventions, as well as challenges for specialists or personnel administering or supporting the programs or interventions. Anecdotally it was noted that perpetrators are likely to be less responsive to interventions delivered by FIFO workers or services. In Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, however, some cited that it was optimal for workforce delivering interventions and supports to be Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander, but not necessarily from the community itself; this can help preserve privacy and, as reported by some stakeholders, preserve pride in certain cultural contexts.

N.9 Research question five: What are some of the barriers for perpetrators accessing services or interventions? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?

In addition to the findings regarding the gaps in the responses (section 1.6; research question two) and the barriers to the provision of a response (section 1.8; research question four), there are a number of more specific barriers that inhibit perpetrators accessing the interventions that are currently available.

As noted in research question two (section N.6), it is understood that there are lengthy waiting times for some community-based services. It was reported that there is little evidence regarding the characteristics of perpetrators with a higher likelihood of responding, or risk stratification tool, which makes prioritisation of participants challenging. Perpetrators mandated to participate in behaviour change programs as part of their probation and parole conditions may be prioritised for access, which can exacerbate delays for access in the context of intervention orders and self-referral.

In the correctional centre and probation and parole settings, there were also challenges with access and facilitating participation. For prisoners on remand, there are practical issues with enrolling them in a 12-week course when the timing of their sentencing and/or release was unknown. This was perceived to be a missed opportunity, but also a challenging space given these potential participants were yet to be sentenced. There are also barriers to access for people in rural and remote areas, as noted in research question four (section N.8), where lack of available programs will sometimes result in participation not being included in their conditions of release for practical reasons.
Similarly, **transport** was also identified as a challenge in small and disadvantaged communities. In particular, stakeholders observed that travelling to other towns and locations and lack of consistent and suitable transport options often negatively impacted the probability and frequency of perpetrators attending programs. Some stakeholders observed that the time of day and week that programs were held also impacted the likelihood of attendance, with different times being more suitable and effective for securing participation from different communities and perpetrators. Resultant sporadic participation in group programs is likely to limit the effectiveness of these types of interventions. This particular access barrier has been addressed by the Cherbourg CJG, arranging for the behaviour change facilitator to be onsite in Cherbourg at the men’s hub on probation and parole reporting day, rather than the perpetrators needing to find their way to Murgon for a weekly session on Thursday evenings.

The **negative stigma associated with domestic and family violence**, and being identified as a perpetrator, was noted as a significant barrier to perpetrators accessing appropriate services. The challenges were magnified in small communities, where it was difficult for perpetrators to be anonymous or discrete when attending programs in town or surrounding areas. For example, it was noted that these perpetrators often found it easier to attend programs when the time could be attributed to being engaged in other activities, such as employment or reporting for probation and parole. It was acknowledged that one-on-one counselling is one way to address concerns of privacy, noting that one-on-one counselling is also appropriate in other circumstances.

**Research question six: What are the barriers to and facilitators of victim safety being realised from perpetrators using these services or interventions? How do these differ in terms of program or intervention type, delivery setting, or cohort?**

There are a number of barriers that limit the extent to which victim safety is realised from perpetrators accessing existing interventions. These include factors pertaining to the programmatic interventions themselves, and factors pertaining to adjunct services and responses for perpetrators. Stakeholders also cited some facilitators of current approaches.

**Program interventions**

Stakeholders cited that there is the potential for **perverse motivations** to participate in interventions in some cases. While there are perpetrators who will voluntarily participate, it was noted that participation can be used by the perpetrator to continue to exert power and control over their partner or ex-partner. The risk of a false sense of security for victim survivors was cited in this scenario, highlighting the importance of being able to notify victim survivors when the perpetrator is commencing a program, and advise them of the potential for manipulation. This was sometimes limited by barriers such as information sharing and service providers not being able to identify or contact the victim survivor. Whilst it is acknowledged that victim survivor advocates are central to perpetrator programs, some stakeholders also noted that identifying and engaging victim survivor advocates was challenging at times.

In the correctional centres trial, there were various experiences and observations regarding motivations for participation. Because the delivery of the program is a trial, participation is voluntary. As such, participation is not officially accounted for in consideration of parole; however, stakeholders noted that some prisoners would perceive that declining to participate would reflect poorly on them. Post-participation survey information indicated that some participants reflected more genuine motivations, and this was reported by the program delivery personnel in these trial centres.

The motivation to participate is closely related to another barrier that was raised regarding the **group composition**
and suitability for group interventions. In consultation with DCSYW, it was noted that providers endeavour to compile optimal group cohorts; however, this is not always practical. In the current correctional centres trial, one site reflected that the composition of the group has been a major factor impacting the trial to date. The willingness and ability to reflect on behaviour and change behaviour was seen as lacking in this cohort, limiting the ability for discussions in the program to be constructive. It was also cited that individuals who are not willing to participate meaningfully can taint better intentioned participants, particularly in correctional centres where particular prisoners may hold a certain degree of influence or status. This highlighted the need for screening tools and/or risk stratification tools to identify appropriate participants for group intervention.

Other barriers regarding the delivery of the structured behaviour change program included considerations of literacy levels of participants and the pace of the course. Stakeholders suggested that more structure and prompts to assist participants with low literacy to complete written tasks would be helpful. The pace of the content was also cited as a barrier at times, with little opportunity to delve into specific topics in detail.

Adjunct services and responses

A number of stakeholders cited that provision of perpetrator programs was only one component in addressing violent and abusive behaviour. Notwithstanding the different gaps in intervention provision and access, services to ensure perpetrators are in conditions conducive to reform and rehabilitation was cited as of upmost importance; housing and employment were two key elements cited by stakeholders.

Suitability of housing, in particular on release from prison, was noted by multiple stakeholders as a challenge for maintaining victim survivor safety. Two points were raised in this regard: first, in smaller communities, there is limited availability of suitable accommodation for perpetrators, and so they will often return to reside with the victim survivor. This can pose a safety risk and will also breach any intervention orders that are in place. This challenge was particularly pronounced in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, where perpetrators have a strong connection to the land and their community, and relocation may cause more harm and disruption. The other consideration for accommodation is the nature of temporary accommodation options. Options such as men’s hostels and boarding houses were described by one stakeholder as “thrusting them back into unhealthy environments” including exposure to alcohol, drugs and other conditions and behaviours that exacerbate underlying risks of reoffending.

The case management approach taken by probation and parole as part of the Community Re-Entry Support Team can work with perpetrators to address needs pertaining to re-entry, such as housing, employment and mental health and alcohol and other drugs support. However, this assumes sufficient supply or access to these services. There was a consistent view that these types of case management approaches would be useful to apply in other settings, including instances of intervention orders, to minimise risks of breaches and reoffending. This was thought to be particularly pertinent given some of the access delays for this cohort to access behaviour change programs, posing safety risks in the intervening period when there is little contact with the service sector.
Facilitators

Cited facilitators of victim survivor safety being realised pertained to both the content of the behaviour change program, as well as other aspects of the delivery of these interventions.

From a program content perspective, a number of stakeholders indicated that the offence mapping activity appeared to have the most significant impact on participants. This activity was also cited by perpetrators as one of the more challenging aspects of the program, where self and peer reflection was facilitated by mapping out the events leading up to a significant incident, and what they could have done differently. This activity is only included in the 75-hour program, not the 50-hour McMaster Disrupting Family Violence men’s behaviour change program.

Another aspect of the content that was seen as facilitating change was the group setting in which the program was delivered. Sharing and reflecting on behaviours in a group scenario contributed to perpetrators taking responsibility for their behaviours. As cited in section 1.6 (research question 2), however, it is important to consider perpetrator characteristics and suitability to participate constructively in a group setting.

The response from the Cherbourg CJG was also contributing to victim survivor safety by having probation and parole reporting taking place at the Muran Djan men’s hub, rather than at the court house. The local stakeholders indicated that in cases where both parties in the relationship have been using violence, they would attend and present to probation and parole together. This also anecdotally impacted the privacy of both parties; this impacted the extent to which the male could engage freely in other services (such as behaviour change and mental health and alcohol and other drugs services), as well as the extent to which the female could speak freely about current circumstances (with the male often present and/or within listening distance).

N.11 Research question seven: What are the future opportunities to contribute to supporting outcome six, i.e. perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account?

Taking into account the current scope and scale of perpetrator interventions, and the barriers to delivery of interventions and access to interventions, there are a number of opportunities identified to optimise the effectiveness of perpetrator responses.

Regarding provision of behaviour change programs, stakeholders cited the following opportunities based on their observations as well as feedback from some participants:

- **Culturally safe and effective responses**: Stakeholders in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities pointed to the greater engagement with and success of programs and interventions more explicitly anchored in local cultures. In particular, stakeholders cited the encouraging trend of ‘getting back to country’ models, which relocate the site of some interventions away from brick-and-mortar urban areas to more traditional settings, and encouraging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men to form a greater connection to the land and its history as part of or to complement the journey of changing their behaviour. Stakeholders also cited cases of reformed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perpetrators to affect positive change in their communities, potentially taking a mentoring role in helping facilitate behavioural change in current and younger perpetrators.

- **Additional skills or subject matter**: access to shorter or adjunct courses was cited by some stakeholders as likely to be a helpful way of both meeting the diverse needs of different perpetrators, as well as providing opportunities for perpetrators awaiting access to longer duration behaviour change programs. Examples included parenting skills and communication
skills. While some of these topics are covered in existing programs, it was acknowledged that more time spent on these topics would be useful.

- **Pre-program screening and support**: having a mechanism to determine the suitability of participants in terms of their willingness and ability to change their behaviour was an area cited for further improvement. This was particularly relevant in the correctional centre setting where some participants had very violent offending histories, of which domestic and family violence was only one component. Suitability of participants is being considered by the QCS team for the second tranche of participants of the trial.

- **Maintenance courses**: another opportunity identified was maintenance intervention. It was acknowledged by a number of stakeholders that the behaviour change programs delivered over a 10 to 12-week period is a short duration of time. Stakeholders cited evidence suggesting longer durations of engagement with perpetrators are favourable; current practice standards cite 26 weeks as recommended. Having an opportunity to access refresher or maintenance courses could be useful; this was also cited as a mechanism that could benefit prisoners who have participated in the full program while at a correctional centre, and are being released into the community, or who are released prior to completing the program.

- **Flexible delivery**: different delivery modalities is an area to explore to address the service gaps in some regional and remote areas outlined in research question two, as well as the critical mass of participants required to engage in group programs (e.g. LGBTIQ, CALD). The structured and sequenced nature of group programs currently offered can result in participants needing to wait for a new intake to start, which can delay access. DSCYW is exploring the evidence and feasibility of delivering behaviour change programs digitally to address some of these access issues.

In terms of the perpetrator response more broadly, there are a number of opportunities to improve perpetrator accountability and, ultimately, improve victim survivor safety; those cited through stakeholder consultation and information provided by agencies include:

- **Case management**: case management was identified as having potential benefits in improved oversight of, and contact with, perpetrators awaiting access for behaviour change programs and facilitating access to other important adjunct services, such as housing, health and employment. While case management was available through CREST following release from prison as one example, a ‘Court Link’ style model was cited as a potential option for providing post court support in the context of civil intervention orders. QCS noted the discontinuity of case management within the correctional centre setting, with current case management of prisoners being handed over to probation and parole on release. An end-to-end case management approach is being explored by QCS, from custody to community. This would increase continuity of psychological services and participation in other programs, such as behaviour change, at the interface of custody and release into community.

- **Co-location and integration**: In small and remote communities, stakeholders highlighted the successes of co-location and integration of services, and noted that further building out these successes could lead to better outcomes in the future. This could include the creation and further development of hubs, and the co-location of services such as probation and parole, as well as related services such as alcohol and other drugs service, other government welfare services such as Centrelink and employment agencies. These approaches overcome logistical and cultural barriers to accessing appropriate supports and services.

- **Adjunct services**: it was noted that there is insufficient access for perpetrators to suitable accommodation, both in the circumstances of leaving the family home if an intervention order is in place, and on release from prison. Housing was consistently cited by stakeholders as a barrier that limits the effectiveness of other interventions. This can be by exposing perpetrators to unfavourable conditions in temporary accommodation. Stakeholders also cited access to housing services as important to mitigate excuses for the perpetrator to return to the family home, putting the victim and family at increased risk.

- **Culture change and system accountability**: another opportunity to contribute towards perpetrator accountability and victim survivor safety was a change in culture and accountability of the system and personnel; this included personnel working in other services that perpetrators that are exposed to, such as different staff in correctional centres, and
police. As noted in section N.8 (research question four), personnel should be exhibiting and reinforcing behaviours and language; this is particularly relevant in correctional centre setting to mitigate the lessons and skills learned during program sessions being lost when participants return to their day-to-day prison life.

- **Timely justice system responses**: ensuring that timely criminal action is taken towards perpetrators, when and where appropriate, was highlighted as a key justice-system level improvement. Stakeholders noted that the current time gap or delay between offending behaviour, and subsequent responsive civil and criminal sanctions may send the wrong message to both victims and perpetrators about the priority, importance and acceptability of domestic violence. This is discussed further in chapter 10 (supporting outcome six) of the main report.

### N.12 Conclusion
Victim survivor and family safety should be at the core of all perpetrator responses. With a growing awareness of domestic and family violence comes a growing understanding of the role of perpetrator services and support, alongside punitive measures, in achieving this objective.

Punitive measures play a role in holding perpetrators accountable for their actions, and therapeutic interventions such as behaviour change programs are important in contributing to reducing the use of violence by perpetrators. The investment in expanding the scope of community-based interventions, and the recent commencement of the trial of domestic and family violence specific behaviour change programs in correctional centres has made progress in addressing gaps in behaviour change programs. Despite this, there remains space for expanding the scope of programmatic responses to account for differences in culture, language and circumstances that are relevant for perpetrators who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, from CALD backgrounds, LGBTIQ, and/or those who are female and/or those with disability. The targeted work of CJGs with male perpetrators is a good example of working with communities to design solutions that are suited to their culture and context (e.g. location), and are more likely to be effective as a result.

Beyond programmatic responses, there was a consistent sentiment that other services and supports, such as case management and accommodation, were important enablers to mitigate exacerbating underlying risks of perpetrators using violence. These adjunct responses ultimately should have victim survivor safety as their primary objective.
Appendix O : QPS state-wide coordinator role

O.1 Overview of case study
This case study comprises one action related to QPS (enabling Action 22):

- Use the Queensland Police Service State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator role as an advocate for the Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator Network by providing leadership and guidance and facilitating opportunities where the network is able to contribute to shaping the future direction of domestic and family violence policing

This action is aligned with supporting outcome seven in the Second Action Plan: The justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence.

Recommendations 136 of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report was deemed implemented in late 2015 with the reinstatement of the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator. The cultural change component of this recommendation – *address the disconnect between policy and practice to engender a consistent approach to the policing response, monitor performance and drive the future direction of policing domestic and family violence with a view to improving practice* – was converted to Enabling Actions 21 and 22 in the Second Action Plan.

Enabling Action 21 is the focus: Use the QPS State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator role to affect and shape the future direction of the QPS in Queensland in line with the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy.

Enabling Action 22 (the selected action) is the operational arm and leverages the Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator network to help implement the reforms at the local level.

O.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this project have been formulated following a consultation with QPS and DPC. These are aligned to the evaluation framework to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Outcome question six (SO6)**, intermediate outcome 6.1: Has the Strategy helped build a more seamless and integrated service response that meets the needs of perpetrators?
- **Outcome questions seven (SO7)**, intermediate outcome 7.1: How effective has the justice system process been in providing coordinated, consistent and timely responses to domestic and family violence matters?
- **Outcome questions seven (SO7)**, intermediate outcome 7.2: To what extent has the justice system been supported to provide comprehensive and integrated services that meet the needs of perpetrators, victim survivors and their families?

The overarching research questions take into consideration the stage of implementation and operation of the action. The key questions include:

1. What are the barriers and enablers when using a network of specialist practitioners, and leadership within the network, to shape organisational direction in responding to domestic and family violence?
2. To what extent and how has the Network, and the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator, affected service integration to meet the needs of perpetrators, victim survivors and their families?
3. To what extent and how has the Network, and the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator, affected service coordination and consistency in policing practice in responding to domestic and family violence across the policing system?
The first two questions focus on understanding progress to date and answering outcome evaluation questions six and seven. Question three focuses on drawing out key learnings to inform the Third Action Plan including how these might be applied in other sectors such as health or education.

O.3 Data sources
The development of this case study has been informed by a review of secondary data sources, supplemented by primary research, including but not limited to:

- Two one-hour focus groups with members of the Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator Network
- One 30-minute interview with the manager of the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Unit
- QPS - ‘Implementation Progress Overview’ - 31 August 2018.

O.4 Overview of the action:
This action is overseen and governed by the QPS with a program logic as shown in Figure O.1. This action revolves around the reinforcement and development of the network of domestic and family violence coordinators in Queensland. An existing network was previously disbanded; the network was then re-established following recommendations in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report.

A network was established prior to the recommendations in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, but disbanded due to the restructure of the QPS after two reviews (Government’s Public Sector Renewal Program and the Police and Community Safety Review) that focused on restructuring and streamlining management layers within QPS.

Lessons learned from the 2013 restructure, the reviews and the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ recommendations have helped inform the Service’s journey to rebuild the domestic and family violence coordinator network.

‘The network’ refers to the state-wide connection of the various domestic and family violence coordinators, overseen and guided by the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator (herein referred to as ‘State Coordinator’). The State Coordinator does not have reporting line responsibility over the individual domestic and family violence coordinators; local reporting lines are maintained. The District Officers have direct line control of the domestic and family violence coordinators and are responsible for performance at a District level. The District Officers are responsible for determining, based on their individual district priorities, where best to locate the domestic and family violence coordinators within their district; and develop in collaboration with them, appropriate locally based strategies to provide sound oversight of domestic and family violence investigations.
During 2018, the addition of 24 coordinators with planned deployment, as seen in Table O.1, raised the number of domestic and family violence coordinators across the state to 54. Capacity of domestic and family violence coordinators varies subject to their locations. Police officers in the domestic and family violence coordinator role are tasked with providing specialist education and training to operational officers, assisting other government and non-government agencies to better address domestic violence-related issues, with some detective capacity. As summarised by stakeholders during consultation, the primary role of domestic and family violence coordinators is to support consistency and best practice in domestic and family violence-related policing, and to champion and advocate for the complexity of domestic and family violence and professional learning and growth in the area.

### Table O.1 Deployment of the 24 new coordinator positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Allocation of domestic and family violence coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North (Cairns)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Isa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capricornia (Rockhampton)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Bay Burnett</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Downs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QPS also reported a trial of two coordinators within the Police Communications Centre for an initial period of six months from September 2018, with an extension to 30 June 2019. This trial aims to provide frontline officers with more support through access to dedicated specialist advice from the domestic and family violence coordinators to assist them when responding to domestic and family violence. These Coordinators, complement the local on the ground network, by providing additional state-wide support to our frontline officers on legislation, policy and practice; appropriate police response to non-lethal strangulation reports; and identification of appropriate support and referral pathways for victims and offenders.

O.5 Research question one: What are the enablers and barriers when using a network of specialist practitioners, and leadership within the network, to shape organisational direction in responding to domestic and family violence?

Stakeholders identified a number of factors that enable the network to achieve its objectives, namely:

- senior leadership support and recognition;
- accessible training opportunities for coordinators and other personnel; and
- relationships of coordinators with local service providers.

Stakeholders reported that senior leadership buy-in is paramount to advocate for and sustain the work of the network. This was cited due to the importance of the Police Service understanding the complexity of domestic and family violence policing, and that this should be emphasised from the top down, and reinforced at a local level by District Officers and other leaders. This leadership increases the likelihood that local officers will engage with the expertise of the domestic and family violence coordinators, including the current extended service offered through the Police Communications Centre. It also increases the likelihood of participation in learning and training opportunities that are offered to generalist officers. Recognition and understanding of the role has been reinforced at a senior level with the introduction of the QPS Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Award in May 2017. This was cited as a significant signal to both the coordinators and the broader police service regarding the importance and complexity of the work led by the coordinators and the priority of best practice domestic and family violence policing in the organisation.

Training opportunities were also cited as an important enabler in enhancing the function of the network and its objectives. This applies to both the domestic and family violence coordinators, and other relevant personnel. It was noted by the state coordinator that one of the key learning and training objectives for domestic and family violence coordinators is to build their capacity to continue to confidently provide value and expertise to their local districts. This is being achieved through providing funded opportunities for coordinators to complete the Graduate Certificate in domestic and family violence at the Queensland University of Technology, in addition to internal training and networking opportunities such as bi-annual state-wide domestic and family violence coordinator workshops. Activities to expand training opportunities for coordinators and other sector staff are in progress (see research question three for more information).

Relationships and connections with local service providers was also noted as an enabler. This included collaboration and interaction with the high-risk teams, and other relevant providers such as the courts and QH. This helps to reinforce the role of the domestic and family violence coordinator, and expose the service system to their expertise to improve consistency of practice. The type of partnerships varied across the network, reflecting local needs.

Stakeholders also cited a number of barriers to the network reaching its potential including:

- variation in role clarification and expectations
- understanding of domestic and family violence across QPS
- change of personnel, including due to staff rotation and secondments
- resource constraints such as time and staffing.

Stakeholders indicated there were gaps in clarity regarding the definition of the coordinator position, noting that this can drive confusion locally and at a network level. While some guidance regarding the role is included in the operational procedures manual, it was reported that there is inconsistency
in how this is applied. One stakeholder mentioned that there could be intentional flexibility afforded to the domestic and family violence coordinator roles in districts to allow for local requirements. Considering the mixed perspectives, it is possible the network could benefit from transparency of communication regarding the definition of the coordinator position; what remains adaptive between districts and what should be consistently applied across the state. Consistency was cited as critical to ensure that best practice and advice is being reinforced across the Queensland Police Service, in particular when personnel and victim survivors are moving between districts.

Another barrier was the gaps across QPS in knowledge and understanding of the complexity of domestic and family violence. Some stakeholders indicated this was coupled with instances of a lack of responsibility and ownership of the issue, though others disagreed, reflecting that domestic and family violence remains a standing agenda item for the Executive Leadership Team. While the release of the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report was cited by those consulted as “a watershed moment” for domestic and family violence reform, they also indicated there may still persist some attitudes that the recent focus on domestic and family violence is transient, as compared to the intention for best practice to become embedded in policing practice. Work is being progressed in this respect, with the development of a Cultural Change Program to balance the expectations of the community with the need to effectively police domestic and family violence. The intent of this work is to involve the workforce in the change process. A potential opportunity was identified to enhance training to highlight best practice, and ensure officers understand the strategic direction of QPS in this regard.

Compounding these challenges is the reported change of personnel in the network including staff rotation and secondments. The pattern of regularly rotating staff and secondments in the network can result in substantial resources being dedicated to upskilling and training, deferring from fulfilling the core support role for the district in some instances. This barrier is not necessarily unique to the network, but nonetheless affects the network.

This has also potentially impacted opportunities to connect and maintain an intra-network relationship. As commented by stakeholders, there has been some tendency towards silos within the network, partly created by limited and ad hoc circulation of information. It was reported that sharing of information is often being initiated by local domestic and family violence coordinators, and the regularity of network newsletter distribution appears to have reduced. While stakeholders cited a perception that local coordinators would be well positioned to exchange information in most cases, they have experienced difficulties due to time constraints.

Stakeholders emphasised the importance of sufficient resource allocation, both within the police workforce, but also recognising the capacity limits of other stakeholders. It was noted that there is a growing demand for services across all aspects of policing. While an extra 24 positions have been funded, there was some confusion from network members regarding the progress of recruitment and deployment of these roles. The alignment of expectations in terms of when positions would be operational was also cited by the state coordinator, given the challenges associated with filling a large number of specialist roles in regions across the state.

O.6  Research question two: To what extent and how has the network, and the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator, affected service integration to meet the needs of perpetrators, victim survivors and their families?

According to stakeholders, the network has been able to make a positive contribution to affecting service integration and delivering positive outcomes for victim survivors and families who experience domestic and family violence. However, there were fewer examples reported of service integration of programs with a perpetrator focus.

Stakeholders reported that contribution to service integration appears to be driven locally, which is consistent with the intention that the domestic and family violence coordinator role is structured to allow for a certain degree of flexibility to the districts’ characteristics. In particular, this includes participating in case management and integrated responses with High-Risk Teams and on an ad hoc basis.
The network has also been able to support collaboration across the sector responding to domestic and family violence. Examples of locally led approaches include:

- establishing working relationships with non-government service providers
- having a representative from service providers co-locate to provide support
- collaborating with QH to appoint a mental health coordinator role
- establishing agreements with local refuges.

Stakeholders indicated that the state coordinator has had less impact on integration, but noted opportunities to leverage this role. For example, the state coordinator could advocate for the development of a state-wide domestic and family violence policing framework to optimise consistency of practice. It was also cited that some momentum may have been lost in the intervening period before the state coordinator role was reintroduced following recommendations in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report.

Research question three: To what extent and how has the Network, and the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator, affected service coordination and consistency in policing practice in responding to domestic and family violence across the policing system?

Stakeholders indicated that they were unsure of the impact that the network and the state coordinator were having on consistency of policing practice across QPS. The uncertainty appeared to be related to the inconsistency in the way the roles have been implemented across the districts, and ongoing challenges with the acceptance and understanding of the complexity of domestic and family violence policing across QPS. One stakeholder noted that this may also be related to the variation between districts in terms of the service system in which the role operates; for example, the presence of HRTs and/or Vulnerable Persons Units in some districts. This can impact the needs of the districts in terms of the role and its function, in addition to local contextual factors.

It was acknowledged, however, that the trial of specialist support available through the Brisbane Police Communications Centre had an important role in improving access to specialist advice to officers across the state to contribute to achieving consistency. As part of the Cultural Change Program, the QPS is conducting a process mapping initiative to identify short, medium and long-term improvement opportunities, clarification of roles and responsibilities and the identification of action plans for improvement in conjunction with relevant QPS Regions and Commands.

There are a number of key training and development opportunities that were delivered or are ongoing, which will build capability, promote best practice, and improve awareness of the network and its function. Delivered or ongoing activities include:

- To raise the profile of the domestic and family violence coordinators to a practitioner level, the QPS offers access to professional development opportunities, such as the Queensland University of Technology Graduate Certificate in Domestic Violence.
- The QPS launched the inaugural domestic and family violence specialist course at the Academy in February 2019 designed for staff performing the roles of domestic and family violence coordinators and DVLOs, VPU and HRT members, as well as investigators and prosecutors. An evaluation of this course is being progressed.
- Domestic and family violence response training for Queensland Ambulance Service;
- Domestic and family violence coordinators played an important role in delivering the two-day vulnerable persons training throughout the state in 2017. This training was delivered to police officers up to and including the rank of Inspector and provided officers with an understanding of new policing responses available to them through the legislative reforms and more importantly, the skills to listen, understand and make an informed decision that is in the best interests of the vulnerable person. The training was also delivered to selected non-sworn members.
- In 2018, domestic and family violence coordinators, police prosecutors, researchers, investigators and members of the Judiciary attended strangulation prevention training delivered by the internationally renowned Training Institute on Strangulation Prevention. Further opportunities for police officers across the five regions to attend this specialist training were offered in March 2019.
The Queensland state coordinator is also in contact with colleagues interstate to share learnings and resources for application as appropriate in the local context. The domestic and family violence Investigator course material is one such example, which has been adopted from a similar program in South Australia.

Notwithstanding the contextual factors of regions, stakeholders believed that there was a role for the state coordinator to continue to strengthen advocacy for a unified policing approach, including essential components such as the description of the coordinator role and risk stratification, to influence consistency. The governance structure of the network relies on District Officers taking advice and guidance from the state coordinator to implement and operationalise this locally. The District Officers have direct line control of the domestic and family violence coordinators and responsible for performance at a District level. The District Officers are responsible for determining, based on their individual district priorities, where best to locate the domestic and family violence coordinators within their district; and develop in collaboration with them, appropriate locally based strategies to provide sound oversight of domestic and family violence investigations.

Anecdotal evidence recorded the current focus on consistency is in policing practice engendered through such actions as: all QPS members participating in relevant training and reinvesting those learnings into improving the domestic and family violence policing response, the state-wide Police Referral Service, and collaboration with internal and external stakeholders to process current reforms and identify future process improvements. There is commentary noting the ongoing efforts of the QPS State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator to be a pioneering advocate and influencer driving cultural change to improve the collective response to domestic and family violence. With displaying the leadership and strengthening the advocacy role for a unified policing approach, the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator will continue to facilitate a platform to harness the collaborative expertise from within QPS and external partners to identify practical and system wide solutions to respond to domestic and family violence, as well as provide training and education opportunities for all police.

**O.8 Conclusion:**

There is evidence of the effectiveness of the domestic and family violence coordinator network in providing support internally within the police service and improving collaboration between the QPS and external agencies. This is attributed to the local coordinators in their place-based contribution to service integration and the State Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator in the leadership and advocacy role. Enablers of the action have been reported to be senior leadership buy-in, accessible training opportunities and strength of the relationship with local providers.

Opportunities to further scale the impacts of the action lie in transparency of communications, advocating for consistent policing practice with respect to domestic and family violence and ensuring senior buy-in across districts. Given QPS has embarked on a journey to progress cultural change toward addressing domestic and family violence, it will be important to continue to monitor and understand progress of this.
Appendix P : DJAG case study – online DV1 form

P.1 Overview of case study
The 'Not Now, Not Ever' Report raised concerns surrounding the complexity of the Application for a Protection Order (DV1), which presented a barrier to persons in need of protection from entering the legal system. A contributor to The Taskforce stated that:

'Women in crisis are frequently traumatised by the violence and struggle to recall detail ... Important questions ... can be lost in the detail of the form and result in the aggrieved not obtaining the protection/responses she needs'.183

In response to this finding, the following action (and focus of this case study) was developed as part of the Second Action Plan:

- Produce simple and easy to understand forms for an application for protection order

This action is aligned with supporting outcome seven in the Second Action Plan; ‘the justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence’. It was delivered by the DJAG.

P.2 Lines of enquiry
The key research questions for this case study have been formulated following consultation with DPC and DJAG. These are aligned to the evaluation framework, to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Outcome question seven**, intermediate outcome 7.1: How effective has the justice system process been in providing coordinated, consistent and timely responses to domestic and family violence matters? (supporting outcome seven)
- **Outcome question seven**, intermediate outcome 7.2: To what extent has the justice system been supported to provide comprehensive and integrated services that meet the needs of perpetrators, victim survivors and their families? (supporting outcome seven)

The research questions consider the stage of the project. The key questions include:

1. How has the online DV1 form contributed to a) coordinated and timely responses, b) system integration and c) reduction in adjournment due to insufficient grounds being provided?
2. What are the benefits of the online DV1 form to: a) applicants for protection orders b) service providers c) agencies?
3. What was the process for developing the new online DV1 form?
4. What are the lessons and learnings from the development of the online DV1 form that could be applied elsewhere?
5. What have been the barriers and enablers of uptake for the online application process?
6. How can use of the online DV1 form be sustained over time to ensure the benefits can be maintained?

Questions one to three focus on understanding progress to date and answering outcome evaluation question seven. The remaining questions draw out key learnings to inform the Third Action Plan, including how these might be applied in other sectors.

P.3 Data sources
This case study has been informed by a review of secondary data sources, including but not limited to project plans, usability testing documents and other implementation and planning documents between 2015 and 2018.

P.4 Overview of action
Defining the problem
A DV1 form is used by Queenslanders to apply to a Magistrates Court for a protection order under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. Persons in need of protection (i.e. the aggrieved) can either have a police officer, lawyer, friend or family member apply for them or complete and lodge a DV1 form in person.

For private applicants who are applying for a domestic violence order without police assistance, prior to the launch of the online version on a web interface, the following options to complete the form existed:

- complete the interactive PDF DV1 form on their computer, then print the form
- print the eight page PDF and complete it by hand
- go to the nearest Magistrates Court and complete a hardcopy of the form on site.

Applicants were also required to complete a one-page aggrieved confidential address form or a one-page domestic and family violence safety form.

After completing the application form, applicants made a statutory declaration before an authorised witness (JP, Commissioner for Declarations or solicitor) and filed the application at a Magistrates Court in Queensland in person or by post. When the aggrieved (or the person lodging it on the aggrieved’s behalf) lodged the application at their chosen Magistrates Court, they were given a court date. Once submitted to the courthouse, court registry staff would give a copy to the Queensland police who would subsequently provide a copy to the person the application was against (i.e. the respondent).

Research with previous applicants using the PDF application form revealed the following statistics:

- 80% of research participants experienced significant challenges understanding, making and lodging their application for a protection order
- 80% of research participants indicated that they did not understand how to complete the application form, even with the guide
- 40% of participants’ applications had been denied in their first hearing due to the manner in which the application had been written.

Noting the complexity of the DV1 form as a barrier to persons in need of protection from entering the legal process, a project was launched to develop the concept of a new online smart DV1 form on the court website. It formed part of an Electronic Domestic Violence Interface (eDV) Business Case to improve timeliness and accuracy of system responses.

About the new online smart DV1 form
The new online smart DV1 form project was largely driven with a private-applicant focus, with the acknowledgement that private applicants can often be disadvantaged during their interaction with the court processes. This is because if they are unable to fund legal representation, or are ineligible for a grant of legal aid, they must proceed with the matter unrepresented.

A small project team, under a cross criminal justice agency program called Integrated Criminal Justice (ICJ), was tasked to review the DV1 form as well as identify opportunities to connect the aggrieved to information safely and quickly. The team was hosted within Queensland Courts and funded by ICJ – a collaborative group of cross-justice-sector agencies including Queensland Courts, Youth Justice, Queensland Police Service, Child Safety, Corrective Services, Office of Director of
Public Prosecutions and State Penalties Enforcement Registry. The project team partnered with the Digital Transformation Team within DJAG to deliver improved online information tools for private applicants.

The ‘Prepare your application for a protection order’ online form, or the new online smart DV1 form, was launched on 1 March 2017 on the court website. The form helps private applicants fill out the eight-page PDF application form (with on-screen guidance and explanation of terms), as well as two other forms if applicable—the domestic and family violence court safety form and confidential application form. After completing the online form, applicants are still required to download a completed PDF package of forms to be witnessed by a Justice of the Peace (JP) and lodged at the Magistrates Court. The new online smart DV1 form can be completed on desktop computers, tablets and mobiles. It incorporates plain English and adopts a teaching approach to make it easier for private applicants to complete their application and also to learn the necessary court language and understand the court process that will follow, so they are better prepared for the next steps in the process.

Within the new online smart DV1 form, the grounds for protection section which was identified as one of the most difficult sections to complete in the application, is now displayed with examples of what happened to them to construct a timeline of events.

The baseline data, prior to the development of the new online smart DV1 form, reflected a relatively high usage of the online PDF form, representing 75% and 90% of the applications in Brisbane and regional areas respectively.¹⁸⁶

A program logic of this action is shown in Figure P.1.

Figure P.1 Program logic of the project on the new online smart DV1 form

---

P.5 Research question one: How has the online smart DV1 form contributed to coordinated and timely responses and system integration?

The web-based interactive form on the court website contributes to system integration through connecting applicants with relevant domestic and family violence services within the service system. Broader information that the applicant may be interested in is also included throughout the online form, thus facilitating connection with domestic and family violence support services. For instance, contact details for counselling helplines including DVConnect, Kids Helpline and Lifeline are displayed on the right hand side of the screen throughout the application process. On the first page, should applicants select the option for guidance to get legal advice, the form will prompt information to refer people to legal support services such as Legal Aid Queensland and Community Legal Centres Queensland. The online form also uses the postcode of the aggrieved to display the details of nearby Magistrates Courts and JPs, so that applicants are aware of their closest JPs and courthouses (where they can obtain further information, certify and lodge the form). The online form personalises the experience for each applicant with their provided details by using the names of the aggrieved and the respondent throughout.

Little information is available about how the form has contributed to coordinated and timely responses. It is anticipated that minimal changes have materialised yet, because the manual lodgement process remains unchanged due to the requirements to print and sign the form with a JP witness. This places a restriction on online submission, which inherently implies little change to the timing of responses from the court and police system.

One of the other objectives of the new online smart DV1 form is to reduce the number of adjournments due to insufficient grounds being provided. In fact, it was recommended that the DV1 form and its usage guide provide prompts for the applicant to specify details such as dates and in-depth detail of the respondent’s behaviour to embody comprehensive and factual information on the application. This, in turn, will improve the likelihood of being granted a protection order in a timelier manner and inherently contribute to fewer adjournments. There is limited evidence to date regarding the interaction between the new online DV1 and court processes, including how the form is tracking against this objective. Of the information available against this objective, evidence is mixed. In a Service Provider Survey in June 2017, four out of 15 respondents revealed their difficulty in completing the grounds for protection section, noting that “the sections which ask you grounds of the application are very confusing and hard to follow”. In contrast, the same number of survey respondents indicated early signs of satisfaction with the prompting nature of the new form, with one stating that he/she “liked that it enables people to be able to be guided through the application”. Further investigation is warranted to inform how the new online smart DV1 form has contributed to reducing adjournments resulting from inadequate provision of grounds.

P.6 Research question two: What are the benefits of the online smart DV1 form to applicants for protection orders, service providers and agencies?

a) Benefits to applicants of protection orders

The benefits to applicants for protection orders were documented as part of the usability testing of the form prototype in 2016. Overall, the benefits of the new online smart DV1 form include:

- Safe and secure for customers e.g. improved safety for the aggrieved with more contact details being kept confidential
- Improved customer experience e.g. remove guesswork, provide reassurance for customers, and have the interactive form usable across devices
- Containing simpler language and explaining more about the court process that follows.

---

188 DJAG. (2017). Prepare your application for a protection order online form evaluation: Survey outcomes report.
190 DJAG. (2016). Prepare your application for protection order form feedback outcomes: Internal findings report.
Positive feedback was given by previous applicants for a protection order and by people who are unfamiliar with the application form and process. Examples from feedback received include comments such as: “Not everyone would know what that meant – having the legal terms [on the right aside] is absolutely brilliant” and “Awesome ... I'm a bit computer illiterate but it seemed basic – I could do it myself”.

A range of safety measures are also incorporated in the new online smart DV1 form to improve the applicant’s experience. Domestic violence offenders often control and monitor the actions of victim survivors on the internet. For this reason, information is provided within the form about how the applicant can protect themselves online. A quick exit is available on the form so that applicants can quickly and discreetly leave the form if necessary. The online form also includes the option to populate the address and contact details of the aggrieved (as well as their children’s, relatives’ and associates' address and contact details) into the separate confidential aggrieved details form, which does not get shared with the respondent—allowing for more personal details to be kept confidential from the respondent.

b) **Benefits to service providers**

Service providers were also involved in usability testing of the prototype and were asked to provide feedback on their experience with the new form. For example, legal and support sector stakeholders provided feedback through a stakeholder survey conducted in June 2017, noting that the sample size was small (n=15). Results revealed stakeholders considered the new DV1 form provided a safe, helpful and valuable tool for service providers that support Queenslanders affected by domestic and family violence. Eight out of 15 survey respondents indicated ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’ to a question that enquired about their level of satisfaction with the new form. The aspects that respondents found most satisfactory with were the amount of supporting information included and technical features. Nine out of 15 survey respondents believed that the new online smart DV1 form would be easier than the online PDF form.¹⁹¹

c) **Benefits to agencies**

There has not been documentation to date that reported the outcomes of the new online smart DV1 form from the perspective of implementing agency representatives. However, the intended benefits for agencies, as specified by the desired end-stage of the development the new online smart DV1 form include:

- Provide a safe, helpful and valuable tool for agencies that support Queenslanders affected by domestic and family violence
- Increase potential for faster and more streamlined business processes as applicants can now have a better understanding of the form, provide more accurate information on a web-based interactive platform, and thus reducing footfall at counter.

User testing with agencies demonstrated high levels of satisfaction with the online smart DV1 form. In a survey from agencies (15 responses), 53% of responses indicated ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’ to a question about their level of satisfaction with the new online smart DV1 form. The remaining survey respondents chose ‘neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’ (n=5), dissatisfied (n=1) or ‘very dissatisfied’ (n=1). The aspects that respondents found most satisfactory were the amount of supporting information included and technical features.¹⁹²

**P.7 Research question three: What was the process for developing the new online smart DV1 form?**

The project commenced in mid-2015 to develop a concept for an online form as part of the eDV Business Case. Since 2014, co-design workshops with stakeholders across the domestic violence sector have been undertaken to develop the form. A summary of project key milestones is outlined in Table P.1.¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ DJAG. (2017). Prepare your application for a protection order online form evaluation: Survey outcomes report.
¹⁹³ DJAG. Project plan – Online smart DV1 form.
Table P.1 Online smart DV1 form project stages and milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agile build of prototype</td>
<td>Agile build of prototype</td>
<td>Incorporate user testing feedback,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability testing of form</td>
<td>Usability testing of form</td>
<td>Gain approval of content brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of prototype concept</td>
<td>Approval of prototype concept</td>
<td>Develop and implement communication plan to promote form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual review and approval</td>
<td>Factual review and approval</td>
<td>Engage with stakeholders to thank them for their participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial review and approval</td>
<td>Editorial review and approval</td>
<td>Online form published and in use by March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of support services to recruit women to conduct usability testing of the online form prototype to gather feedback from users</td>
<td>Engagement of support services to recruit women to conduct usability testing of the online form prototype to gather feedback from users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of the new online smart DV1 form relied on a comprehensive process of co-design with stakeholders including but not limited to:

- Co-design workshop with representatives from DJAG, legal and support service providers on 12 November 2015
- Stakeholder survey with internal and external stakeholders who work to assist people experiencing domestic and family violence in Queensland on 8 March 2016
- Usability testing with participants who have not had any prior experience with domestic and family violence from 31 March–01 April 2016
- Useability testing with nine people who were victim survivors of domestic and family violence and applied for a domestic violence protection order between 2014 and 2016.
  - Participants were recruited by support services in regional Queensland, and South East Queensland, covering a variety of demographic characteristics. Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Family Violence Legal Service and Women’s Legal Service were approached to engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.
  - The form feedback sessions were conducted remotely at three participating support service facilities with a DJAG team member phoning in to take notes in July and August 2016.

These multiple usability testing sessions contributed to a minimum viable product (MVP) development cycle, comprising five steps: design inception, rapid prototyping, agile build, release and continuous quality improvement. The new online smart DV1 form is in continuous quality improvement.

194 There were also two activities documented in the DJAG’s project plan for the online smart DV1 form, however progress on these is uncertain. These activities include investigating integration with court systems and investigating the potential removal of JP signature.
improvement stage following its launch on 1 March 2017.\textsuperscript{195} A stakeholder survey was fielded in June 2017 to seek feedback from legal and support service providers with regard to their interaction with the new form.

P.8 Research question four: What are the lessons and learnings from the development of the online smart DV1 form that could be applied elsewhere?

A process that was used in the development of this new online smart DV1 form and could be of assistance for future co-design processes is the iterative minimum viable product (MVP) development cycle. This cycle involves build–measure–learn loop. That is, building the item (in this case the online smart DV1 form), measuring feedback through user testing, and then incorporating any learnings for the final product. Applying to designing and launching online products, this MVP approach enables two concurrent processes: identifying what can be delivered now to improve the customer experience and achieve business benefits, and also mapping out the desired end-stage. As a result, it allows for delivery of milestones before the final product is delivered. Another key benefit of this approach is that it captures real-time customer feedback to shape future decisions about product improvements. This approach can ensure that the future products can maximise its alignment with customer needs where possible. If customers’ needs evolve, the feedback can be received and decisions can be made in regard to the changes suggested.

Development of the new online smart DV1 form also involved several rounds of usability testing, which included different cohorts of participants, including victim survivors, flexibly recruited via market research or support providers. This enabled the new online smart DV1 form to reflect feedback from multiple user groups, which is important as it is intended to serve a diverse range of users, including support service providers, the aggrieved and/or families and friends of the aggrieved. Usability testing of the form’s prototype was also a feature that enabled the form to be refined to ensure it was easy for customers to use, met their needs and inspired trust and confidence.

The usability testing strategy by DJAG included the recruitment of victim survivors of domestic and family violence via support services with DJAG staff dialling in to take notes, to capture the end-user and victim survivor perspective. This may be a potential approach for recruitment of victim survivors to participate in research pertaining to domestic and family violence.\textsuperscript{196}

P.9 Research question five: What have been the barriers and enablers of uptake for the online application process?

The form has received positive feedback through social media since going live on 1 March, having reached more than 32,000 people in the first two weeks. Some enablers and barriers of uptake have been identified by a stakeholder survey with legal and support service providers following the launch.

The identified enablers of uptake of the new online smart DV1 form include:

- easy to understand:
  - The definitions, information and explanatory notes within the form
  - The simple plain English language used
  - The prompting nature and way in which applicants are guided through the form
  - The form is easy to complete and follow.

- accessibility of the form, as demonstrated by:
  - The ability for clients using a mobile device to access the form; and
  - The accessibility of arriving at the form via an organic search, as opposed to other channels such as social networks, referrals and emails;

Some barriers to uptake were outlined from stakeholder surveys and feedback. These include:

- difficult to use in some sections of the form:
  - The grounds for the protection section is hard to follow
  - The form is too long and involves too much reading

- concerns about maintaining privacy

\textsuperscript{195} DJAG. (2016). Prepare your application for a protection order: Product roadmap

\textsuperscript{196} DJAG. (2016). Prepare your application for protection form feedback outcomes: Internal findings report.
• limited integration with services e.g. there is no easy link to a local domestic violence service
• utility of the form:
  o The lack of the functionality to save and return to the form
  o Restrictions on online submission due to requirements for signatures and JP witnessing.

P.10 Research question six: How can use of the new online smart DV1 form be sustained over time to ensure the benefits can be maintained?
In June 2017, a survey was distributed to legal and support sector stakeholders who have had experience with, or exposure to, the new online smart DV1 form since it was launched. According to this survey, recommendations to sustain the use of this form include those that would potentially address the barriers to the form uptake. For example:

• Enhancing the form’s utility by including the functionality to save and return to the form
• Aiding users’ comprehensibility by reviewing the design of grounds for protection section on the form in terms of the structure, layout of questions and the amount of information that needs to be included
• Monitoring ongoing use of the form by incorporating some automated data capture into the online form submission to provide further analytics around the use of the form.

P.11 Conclusion
Acknowledging the suggestion in the ‘Not Now, Not Ever’ Report, which associated the complexity of using a hardcopy form to apply for a protection order as a possible barrier to victim survivors entering the legal process, DJAG reviewed the private application procedure and developed a new online smart DV1 form. This form integrates three existing forms and an information guide into one user-friendly online tool, developed through a co-design process and multiple rounds of usability testing that involved several intended user groups. Since its launch in March 2017, there has been evidence that the new form offers assistance to private applicants in their completion of the application, primarily by increasing the form’s overall comprehensibility and accessibility. However, barriers to uptake included navigation of certain sections of the form and save and come back functions. To sustain the use of this form, monitoring use of the form and ongoing refinements based on feedback may be worthwhile.
Mossman Community Justice Group provide essential domestic and family violence support and services. The group has a Community Justice Group Co-ordinator with the support of a Men’s Domestic and Family Violence Coordinator. In 2017, the group opened the Mossman Justice Hub through funding provided by DJAG as part of a co-design domestic and family violence response process undertaken with the Mossman community. In 2018, the group held Men’s Group meetings each Monday. The Justice Hub also hosts service providers providing a safe and appropriate place for clients to attend. The group was instrumental in holding the first White Ribbon Walk in Mossman. This brought together approximately 20 different service providers within the community to talk about domestic and family violence, including the Mossman Council, Appinypina, Queensland Police Service, Relationships Australia, the local schools, church and courthouse. Attendance at this event, now in its fifth year, has increased over time.

Q.1 Lines of enquiry
The research questions were formulated following consultation with DJAG and the Mossman CJG. This case study is aligned to the supporting outcomes six and seven in the Second Action Plan:

- Work with community justice groups in discrete communities to develop and maintain culturally appropriate domestic and family violence justice service responses in each community
- Engage with community justice groups in each community to build local authority structures.

The evaluation framework aims to meet the following intermediate outcomes/sub-evaluation questions:

- **Process question four**: How do enablers or barriers differ by context? This includes at the agency, interagency and whole-of-government level, across locations (rural, regional, metropolitan) and types of initiatives?
- **Outcome question one**: To what extent are victims and their families safe and supported? (supporting outcome five)
- **Outcome question six**: To what extent have perpetrators stopped using violence and are they held to account (supporting outcome 6)?
- **Outcome question seven**: Does the justice system deal effectively with domestic and family violence (supporting outcome 7)?
- **Outcome question eight**: To what extent has progress been made to address equity priorities for vulnerable groups (equity)?

The research questions include:

1. How has DJAG worked with Mossman Community Justice Group to develop and maintain culturally appropriate domestic and family violence justice service responses? What has worked well and what could be improved?

2. How has DJAG engaged with Mossman Community Justice Group to build local solutions to respond to local issues regarding domestic and family violence? What has worked well and what could be improved?

3. What are the strengths of community led responses to domestic and family violence?

4. How does the community led approach reflect cultural values and community needs?
• What is the context of place and people for delivering domestic and family violence services in Mossman?
• How service responses are culturally appropriate and meet the needs of victims?
• What has worked well and what could be done better?

5. What are the features of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led community response?

6. What are the enablers and barriers to developing and delivering Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led community responses to domestic and family violence?

7. What is the role of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men in a community led response to domestic and family violence?

8. What are the future opportunities to further strengthen the Mossman Community Justice Group service response? What are the learnings for other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community led responses?

Q.2 Data sources
The data sources for this case study, include:

• Nine 30 to 45-minute interviews with representatives from:
  o Community Justice Group
  o Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service (ATSILS)
  o Youth Development Coordinator
  o Youth Justice
  o Queensland Police Service
  o Courthouse coordinator (QGAP)
  o Probation and Parole
  o Legal Aid
  o Relationships Australia

• Three 30 to 45-minute interviews with participants from the men’s group

Q.3 Research questions one and two: How has DJAG worked with Mossman Community Justice Group to:

  a) develop and maintain culturally appropriate domestic and family violence justice service responses?

  b) build local solutions to respond to local issues regarding domestic and family violence

In 2016–17, DJAG started its four-year $11 million program to support CJG responses to domestic and family violence in 18 discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. As part of this, it funded the Mossman CJG to develop and maintain culturally appropriate domestic and family violence service responses. To date, the Mossman CJG has received $150,000 of this to deliver their response.

A feature of how DJAG has engaged with CJGs, including in Mossman, has been through a co-design approach. One of the advantages of the co-design process has been people from agencies coming together to work alongside the CJG and service providers, as well as other community organisations and community members. Together, the co-design process collectively explored and unpacked complex issues and identified different potential responses. Through this, new, collectively owned knowledge, ideas and shared experiences were gained. Importantly, the issue was discussed from multiple view-points, allowing a more holistic and systemic analysis.

The relationships built through a collaborative and action orientated co-design approach created the groundwork for stronger partnerships and trust needed for any systemic or significant change to occur in Mossman. This involved extensive and regular consultation with community, consistently working together on a daily basis. An important aspect of the co-design approach was that it comprised of people with different skills and knowledge, coupled with passion to influence change in the local community. This enabled different people to identify how their organisation could contribute
to the response, including their different capacities for creating change, the relationships between them, and who and what needed to be activated to enable change to occur. The presence of the CJG was a key factor to enable success.

**Q.4** Research question three: what are the strengths of community led responses to domestic and family violence?

The Mossman CJG model shows that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community-led initiatives to domestic and family violence support community safety and the theory of place-making. A strength of using the CJG, is that they are aware of the dynamics of the families in the community and are culturally appropriate because of the role of Elders in their work. Stakeholders commented that strengths include the CJG’s hard work, resilience, passion and visibility in the community (i.e. being part of community events and being seen at community meetings or supporting community activities). Stakeholders reported this momentum drives everyone to work together.

In the case of Mossman, community-led responses have helped to create a trusted connection within the community, which contributes to victim survivor and perpetrator outcomes. The Mossman CJG is well connected and is known and trusted by the community, with links to relevant services. In this way, the CJG is the mechanism to focus effort and maximise opportunities to connect people to the right services and facilitate improved understanding of the justice system. It also means they are able to effectively connect clients with the appropriate services, including emergency housing, and services to provide food and clothing. For participants, the trust developed between the CJG and community reassures them of their confidentiality, privacy, comfort, and respect through cultural safety.

The community-led response provides a holistic approach to clients. Rather than focus on one element of the system, the design of the CJG meant that the needs of perpetrators and victim survivors were able to be addressed in a holistic manner. That is, because clients may be accessing multiple services, the CJG was able to understand this and provide support with an understanding of all of their service needs. This flexibility meant the CJG was able to provide information to help people understand the justice system as a whole.

A further strength of the community-led model is that the design enabled local capacity building. Stakeholders reported that the CJG model plays a critical role in communicating key messages about domestic and family violence to a range of local service provider personnel and building confidence in local workers as to how to respond appropriately. The CJG is aware of the community attitudes towards offending, so they were able to appropriately communicate prevention messages (It’s not ok) in an effective manner with their clients.

Perhaps the most critical feature of the model is that it builds trust and respect, which facilitates people working together, rather than working in silos.

> “The definite strength is how everyone works together. We work closely with the courthouse, the community centre and we are a tight group.”

A final strength of the model is that it serves as a vehicle for individuals and their families in the community to advocate for family safety. For example, the CJG is heavily involved in the White Ribbon Day and the coordinators help organise events with the courthouse, and local service providers. In this way, the CJG collaborates, coordinates and networks across the complex systems in communities. Interviewees reported it worked because the community and the stakeholders have respect for the CJG.

**Q.5** Research question four: How does the community led approach reflect cultural values and community needs?

The community-led approach contributes to culturally safe responses. An example of this is the new, larger office space, which allowed for positive interactions. It also meant the space was more

---

197 Placemaking is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces. Placemaking capitalises on a local community's assets, inspiration, and potential, with the intention of creating public spaces that promote people's health, happiness, and well being.
welcoming and culturally safe. Creating ‘hubs’ of safety, wellbeing and activity helped to decrease the stigma and shame associated with being in these locations.

“This space feels safe for a lot of people and if it wasn’t for this safe space and if we were just running this group in another location I don’t think we would get the attendance and I don’t think we would get the people opening up and having a bit of a laugh with us and talk with us. I think a lot of it has got to do with how safe they feel in this place.”

Stakeholders reported that the trusted role of the CJG facilitates local peoples’ entry into and engagement with, services, thus better meeting local needs. Stakeholders stated that the CJG is a lynchpin of entry into other services and access to a range of services clients need.

“Important to try and be separate from that [mandatory compliance] and you attend this for your own benefit rather than being seen to be part of [voluntary compliance]. That is great credit to Christine and although they are part of criminal justice system they are absolutely no barrier and people are not constrained by the fact that are here.”

“There are always some that only turn up for compliance, but most are here consistently out of respect and trust. That has been earnt here in the CJG.”

They do this by chasing up clients, supporting them to attend sessions, and keeping them motivated. By perpetrators having someone to trust who can be relied upon for support in their journey, engagement is optimised. Indeed one of the positive outcomes noted was that through this trusted service role, the Mossman CJG was able to shift client motivations and conversations, and in doing so, better meet their needs. It was reported that rather than clients attending to adhere to bail conditions or DVO compliance, they were commencing to actively engage with services because they were motivated to change their behaviour:

“People used to only really do it for sessions compliance but now they continue on themselves.”

Q.6 Research question five and six: What are the features of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander led community response? What is the role of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men in a community led response to domestic and family violence?

A key feature of the Mossman community-led response has been the presence of a service connector to bring consistency, and transfer trust and respect so that clients will use the services. The additional funding supported a position that enabled success of the model. The victim survivors and perpetrators are more likely to engage in services if they trust the CJG to keep their information confidential and private. Improving perpetrators readiness to change by motivating them to engage voluntarily rather than to meet compliance can be achieved through the cultural connections with Elders and the support provided by the co-ordinators and support workers in the CJG.

The trust is also developed through the involvement of Elders in the community (the CJG coordinators link clients and the Elders). It was reported that clients trust the CJG because they respect the Elders, and the coordinators treat the Elders with respect when working with them. This is considered a current backbone of the CJG, but more male Elders participating, and succession planning is a challenge. These challenges will require consideration and future planning.

Each community should determine how best to apply this in their context, including which organisation may be the best to steward. The practicalities of funding or coordinating funds may be better suited to a flexible funding modality.

Q.7 Research question seven: What are the enablers and barriers to developing and delivering Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led community responses to domestic and family violence?

The deep trust within this community has been the foundation of success. Trust is key because of the confidentiality and the privacy of client information. For some people attending domestic and family violence programs there are many service providers working with them. Understanding what is going on for that person holistically in their lives through a central connector enables better support.
Additional enablers to developing and delivering Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led community responses to domestic and family violence, through the Mossman case study include:

- Engaging people willing to work together
- Passionate people who are local and will remain consistent over a long time to build trust and respect
- A central point of contact to connect clients to services they need
- A good venue to help engagement to motivate participants.

The venue itself was also an important enabler. It was located centrally, close to everything and was large enough to give people privacy to run programs. Further, community members donated artwork to create a welcoming atmosphere, and make the space their own. All of these elements are important enabling factors in the work done by the CJG and help them to achieve positive outcomes for Mossman.

Another barrier was transport. With no public transport in the area it is vital to have services funded to transport clients and undertake outreach.

**Q.8 Research question eight:** What are the future opportunities to further strengthen the Mossman Community Justice Group service response? What are the learnings for other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community led responses?

Opportunities to strengthen the Mossman CJG service response include an expansion of existing programs. This could include specific programs for women, including female perpetrator programs and counselling, more emergency housing options and expansion of existing programs. Any additional programs would require commensurate increase in funding for additional staff.

There are great possibilities for the future because the backbone or the foundation has been created through the CJG and because the community knows best how to address domestic and family violence. They may be able to expand their portfolio to include other areas that the community wants to address.

The use of flexible funding could be evolved further. Flexible funding options are currently available to the CJG, who work with DJAG to spend the funding. It was noted that funding was a component of co-design and community-led principles and could be further embedded within these principles. As such, monitoring and evolving this component further may be an opportunity. As one example, currently the CJG and DJAG must wait until the end of the Financial Year and approval from the DG to facilitate some of this flexibility. One opportunity to improve the current model could be to create a process through which flexible spending could be negotiated throughout the year.

**Q.9 Conclusion**

This case study highlights the importance of communication, trust and connection in enabling the CJG to promote awareness of domestic and family violence, build capability across service providers and within the community, and maintain strong working relationships. Working closely with stakeholders through extensive consultation and co-design from the outset assisted in avoiding duplication in service delivery and building the relationships relied upon now in delivering the hub. The co-design approach created a local service connector to bring consistency and develop trust and respect so that clients will use services.

The community-led response provides a holistic approach to clients. Rather than focus on one element of the system, the design of the CJG meant that the needs of perpetrators and victim survivors were able to be addressed in a holistic manner. This flexibility meant the CJG was able to provide information to help people understand the justice system.
Appendix R : Bystander campaign evaluation
Evaluation Report

Supporting implementation of the evaluation framework for the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy

qld.gov.au/dosomething

In an emergency call the police on triple zero (000).
Communication goal

All adult Queenslanders are active and effective bystanders in the case of domestic and family violence (DFV). There are four key communication goals: knowledge (of what constitutes DFV); commitment (to taking responsibility for intervening safely and appropriately); capacity (to intervene); confidence (to take safe and appropriate action).

Audience

All Queenslanders 18+ years

Key successes

• The campaign has achieved the four communication goals: increasing Queenslanders’ knowledge; commitment; capacity and confidence
• Knowledge: There have been some improvements in the knowledge of what constitutes DFV of those exposed to the bystander campaign, especially with increased recognition that non-physical types of emotional or financial abuse are DFV. Those aware of the campaign had elevated perceptions that these types of DFV were also serious, compared to those who did not see the campaign.
• Commitment: 65% self-report the campaign gave them ‘permission’ to intervene.
• Capacity and confidence: Queenslanders are more confident and comfortable in their ability to take appropriate action in the instance of DFV compared to 1 year ago. There is direct evidence of the campaign being influential on these shifts.
• Among individuals who were both aware of the campaign and took intervention action against DFV in the past six months, approximately 1 in 3 self-reported their decision to intervene was influenced in part by having seen the Bystander Campaign.
• 94% of those aware of the campaign consider ‘the advertising to be important’.

GCS Evaluation Framework*

Reform Objectives
(Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to DFV)

Communication Objectives
Campaign Objectives: to increase: knowledge; commitment; capacity; confidence. To encourage effective intervention, with a focus on the factors that influence an individual’s decision to intervene.

Inputs:
What was done before and during activity
• Appropriateness of planning and design undertaken
• Content creation
• Content delivery
• Phased approach suitability

Outputs:
What was delivered/target audience reached
• Reach
• Frequency of exposure
• Level of added bonus value
• Dwell times
• Completion rates on viewing video content

Outtakes:
What the target audience think, feel or do
• Recall of campaign
• Engagement with campaign
• Message receipt
• Knowledge of what constitutes DFV
• Awareness of appropriate interventions
• Awareness of support services available
• Make it clear what people need to do
• Gender sensitive

Outcomes:
The result of activity on the target audience
• Believe they have permission to intervene
• Personal commitment to take responsibility for taking action
• More likely to intervene / greater confidence to intervene
• Actual intervention and choice of appropriate method
• Greater societal impact observed

System Level Impact:
The quantifiable impact at the societal level.
• Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to DFV.
• Changing attitudes through awareness and understanding to achieve the goal of ending violence.


Bystander Campaign Evaluation Overview

1. Inputs

Inputs have been developed using best practice approaches and learnings and are clearly linked to Queensland Government strategy and program logic. The campaign development was comprehensive in its approach.

Planning and Preparation

• Bystander Campaign program logic developed
• Extensive community research in 2017
• Academic literature review
• Stakeholder engagement activities
• Consortium approach with experts in the development of the campaign strategy, including with an advertising agency, MATE program, market research provider and cross-cultural advisor
• Gender sensitive approach adopted to design of campaign
• Incorporation of behaviour change theory
• Clear campaign phasing strategy and goals

Content inputs

• Campaign materials pre-tested twice with adjustments made to approach
• Mainstream media:
  – Bystander Campaign TVCs (female and male roles portrayed)
  – Cinema, transit panels, digital illuminated panels at bus stops and city signage, convenience advertising
• Digital and social media
  – End DFV website – owned by DCSYW
  – YouTube, Facebook, Spotify, Xaxis, Yahoo!, Mamamia article
• Supporting materials and content appropriate to direct action
• Appropriate and consistent linkages with resources and on-the-ground services
2. **Outputs**

The campaign reached its intended audience through a multi-channel campaign strategy. This clearly allowed all segments of the population to be exposed in a means well suited to their media consumption preferences (mainstream media type or digital media preferences).

- Total TV TARPS (Target Audience Rating Points: commonly used to measure the number of TV advertising slots and audience numbers expected) exceeded the set targets, including $173,003 in free placement above paid for advertising
- 1.4 million YouTube views
- 2.5 million unique users reached via digital means (exc. YouTube)
- High levels of dwell time on campaign website: more than 2 minutes on landing page and 3-4 minutes on content pages = a more engaged audience

**EVALUATION**

- Frequency of TV viewing outside of Brisbane exceeded targets with 74% viewing 1+ times, Brisbane audience frequency in target range
- Well above average completion rate for videos on YouTube (45% v. 29% Govt benchmark) = a more engaged audience
- 118,669 people reached through social media amplification (sharing of content beyond original article readership) of the Mamamia content
- Males particularly engaged in digital content (higher YouTube completion rates, more impressions and click on mobile ads, more clicks on Facebook ads than female activity)

3. **Outtakes**

The campaign performed well in generating presence, engaging the audience and conveying messages. These outtake measures for the campaign were stronger than typically seen in other government advertising benchmarks.

- 58% prompted recall of the campaign material
- The campaign was well recalled when prompted for each TV version (female bystander ad 48%; male bystander ad 44%) and convenience/newspaper (26%)
- Facebook campaign pieces were recalled when prompted more often by younger audiences (30% recall in 18-25yrs)
- Campaign considered important by almost all (94%) who recalled seeing the campaign when prompted

4. **Outcomes**

The campaign has been influential in increasing recognition of personal commitment and responsibility as a bystander and confidence in being able to identify and intervene in a suitable way.

- At an overall Queensland population level, it is too early to see consistent evidence of the campaign leading to a decrease in ‘doing nothing’ after seeing or hearing a DFV incident
- However, approximately 1 in 3 of those who have taken prior bystander action and saw the Bystander Campaign self-reported they were influenced to do so in part by having seen the campaign
- 16% discussed the issue of DFV with others after seeing the campaign
- Queenslanders are more confident in their ability to offer the right kind of help compared to 2017; with those aware of the campaign holding a greater level of confidence (59% of those aware feel confident) compared to those not aware

- 67% self-report greater awareness of their personal role in preventing DFV
- Among those who recalled seeing the campaign, 65% feel the campaign gives them permission by the Government to intervene
- 42% self-report they would feel more comfortable calling police as a result of seeing the campaign
- Females aware of the campaign reported the largest increase in levels of comfort intervening in a safe way across many different types of interventions; males remain more reluctant to take actions across most types of intervention measured in the post-evaluation research
- 72% still agree that most people turn a blind eye to DFV

5. **System level impacts**

The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy takes deliberate and diverse approaches to changing attitudes and behaviours towards DFV. Only by first changing social attitudes through awareness and understanding can the goal of ending violence be realised. The long term goal is for Queenslanders to take a zero tolerance approach to DFV. The Bystander Campaign was concerned with awareness raising. That is, educating the community to recognise DFV and the need to act. It is unlikely that, at this point in the overall communications strategy, that system level impacts such as attitudes held by society (which suggest changes in behaviour) associated with the campaign will shift. It is, however, important to monitor system level impacts over time to monitor the communication campaign’s contribution to the long term goal.

Beliefs and attitudes held by Queenslanders as measured in the Bystander Campaign post-evaluation research:

- 72% agree that most people turn a blind eye to DFV
- 63% are still concerned about intervening
- 52% agree that it is primarily the victim’s responsibility for leaving DFV
Ipsos has drawn upon twenty-two documents provided by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet related to the development of the Bystander Campaign and the post-evaluation measures obtained. The assessment of key learnings and future direction incorporates insights and findings from these documents as well as an external opinion formed by Ipsos on the performance of the campaign and its appropriateness.

Key Learnings

**Multiple touchpoints:**
- The broad, multiple touchpoints approach was successful in creating a consolidated campaign reaching different segments of the general Queensland population in a manner appropriate to them. This is evidenced in the high recall of the campaign (above Government benchmark data), high recall of non-TV components and the differing response to varying campaign materials by demographic groups.

**Simplification of campaign:**
- The simplification of communication goals and messages after the initial pre-testing was appropriate and well considered in light of the complexity of the issue. A simplified message is also considered appropriate for the initial phase of a long term behavioural change campaign where subsequent phases can build upon knowledge gained.

**Impact on individuals achieved:**
- Detailed post-evaluation results show the campaign generated discussion and is having an impact at an individual level increasing awareness of the actions that constitute types of DFV, personal responsibility, permission to intervene and confidence in ability to intervene. Some barriers still exist, such as that 72% of Queenslanders in the post-evaluation research continue to agree that most people turn a blind eye to DFV (71% in 2017). It is too early to see significant behaviour change impacts such as substantial decreases in reported DFV incidences or increases in instances of self-reported actual bystander intervention over this short period also noting the Bystander Campaign was intended to raise awareness, rather than create behaviour change.

**Building on the initial message:**
- There may be benefit in further research to understand if potential message fatigue exists and if there are increase opportunities for incremental knowledge transfer in the target audience to avoid wear out and support overall behaviour change of the overall reform.
- These insights arose during post-analysis conducted by MediaCom based on their experience of digital campaign wear out and the postanalysis research by Enhance Research specifically recommending more tailored messaging to address males being unsure how to intervene. This finding was also emphasised by key stakeholders based on their experience in running communications campaigns over repeated phases.
- Any future campaigns will need to overcome core barriers that need to be overcome such as Queenslander beliefs and attitudes noted in the campaign post-evaluation research that 63% of Queenslanders are still concerned about what might happen with them if they intervene, 72% agree that most people still turn a blind eye to DFV (leading to society normalising this sort of behaviour) and 52% still agree that it is primarily the victim’s responsibility for leaving DFV.
- One of Queensland Government’s intermediate outcomes to achieving a zero tolerance approach to DFV is that ‘Queenslanders understand all types of DFV are unacceptable’. While campaigns including Bystander consistently convey that DFV is ‘not okay’ and ‘serious’ it is subtle in its emphasis.
- Theory of Change models for bystander action demonstrate that in order for individuals to take action they need to be more aware of DFV and the role of an active bystander, understand they need to intervene, assume responsibility, know what to do and have confidence to do it. They may also be influenced by what they see around them, what they believe others think they should do, and what they think others do. The Bystander Campaign is working in the realm of the internal influences on decision-making process and the campaign achieved some improvements at this level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>R.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Impact</td>
<td>R.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Framework</td>
<td>R.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insights for the way forward</td>
<td>R.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources and documents</td>
<td>R.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) is responsible for delivering 11 recommendations from Not Now, Not Ever: Putting an end to DFV in Queensland, related to changing the attitudes of Queenslanders to DFV.

DPC has developed a DFV Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy 2016-2026, which outlines an initial three year program targeting specific population groups. This strategy highlighted the importance of engagement and communications founded on a strong evidence base, and building this evidence base over time.

The long term goal of the communication campaign, Bystander, is to achieve an outcome where all adult Queenslanders are active and effective bystanders in the case of DFV.

Both within Australia and Internationally there is a long-held recognition of the importance of others being ‘active’ bystanders in contributing to the long term societal reduction of DFV and the role of ‘passive’ bystanders, who fail to act and ultimately reinforce undesirable behaviour and social norms.

The Bystander Campaign had four specific communication goals, to increase: **knowledge** (of what constitutes domestic violence); **commitment** (to taking responsibility for intervening safely and appropriately and by not intervening they are condoning the behaviour); **capacity** (to intervene, with knowledge of effective strategies); **confidence** (to take safe and appropriate action).

The Bystander Campaign is intended to be a long-term phased campaign, with initial focus on encouraging effective intervention. It was not intended to achieve sustained behaviour change; however the evaluation has considered these metrics to provide contextual information.
Impacts of the campaign mapped against the Knowledge-Attitudes-Behaviour (KAB) Theory of Change model

The Knowledge-Attitude-Behaviour (KAB) theory of change model shows that behaviour change is affected by knowledge and attitude changes. Further, the model subscribes that influencing behaviour occurs over the long-term, while any changes in knowledge and attitudes can be viewed as indications of future behaviour change. The model is augmented to capture the influence of social norms and peers on an individual’s decision-making process. The entire Bystander Campaign relates back to this Theory of Change model as it seeks to address individual knowledge through impacting a person’s knowledge of what constitutes DFV and how to intervene as a bystander. It also aims to impact an individual’s attitudes through their capacity and confidence to intervene. It demonstrates that in order for individuals to take action they need to be more aware of DFV and the role of an active bystander, and understand that they need to intervene and why it is important. They may also be influenced by what they see around them, what they believe others think they should do, and what they think others do.

The Bystander Campaign is working in the realm of the internal influences on the decision-making process and the campaign achieved some improvements at the this level as shown by the campaign goal pre and post campaign measures in the yellow section of the diagram below.

![Diagram showing changes in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour post-campaign compared to pre-campaign measures.](Image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding all forms of DFV</td>
<td>% Agree ‘I would be confident that I would be able to offer the right kind of help to someone experiencing DFV’</td>
<td>Bystanders take appropriate and safe action to prevent and respond to DFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-CAMPAIGN MEASURE</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Too early to tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 83% of all survey participants</td>
<td>% Agree ‘I have a stronger intention to intervene in a DFV incident’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those exposed to the campaign have a greater knowledge of what constitutes domestic and family violence</td>
<td>% Agree ‘I am more aware of different ways to intervene’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>% Agree ‘I am more aware of support services available’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-CAMPAIGN MEASURE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 87% of all survey participants</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those exposed to the campaign have capacity to intervene, with knowledge of effective strategies</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those exposed to the campaign show commitment to taking responsibility for intervening safely and appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer norms / support – No evidence of change**

**Societal norms / culture – No evidence of change**

*Source: Data is sourced from Enhance Research post-evaluation Research.  
*Note: Results are not directly comparable to QSS results due to differences in methodology and sample sizes*

The bystander literature points to broader societal and peer influences being important in changing behaviour, as essential elements in a Theory of Change model to make an overall impact on bystander behaviour culture. At this early stage of changing behaviour, the campaign did not attempt to address or use external influences (i.e. there is only the subject and bystander in the campaign content and messaging and no reinforcing peers or social norming content).

There is limited measurement of these external influences in the range of data sources available to determine the current peers influence or social norms in Queensland. There are some minor societal shifts evident the Enhance Research campaign post-evaluation research, which showed that there was increased acknowledgement among Queenslanders that both men and women can equally be the perpetrator of DFV (up to 37% from 28% in 2017). However, this increase was noted both for those who had viewed the campaign (up to 39%) versus those who had not (up to 35%), so it is difficult to attribute this change in acknowledgement directly to the Bystander Campaign and it is possible that the campaign may have been just one of many influencing factors. Currently there are no appropriate measures to gauge the relationship and impact of peer norms and support on individual behaviour.
To provide a granular assessment of the campaign, the format of the UK Government Communication Service (CGS) Evaluation Framework has been recommended. This framework clearly distinguishes the outputs across a spectrum of impact and enables a consistent language and structure to apply consistently to other campaign evaluations. The diagram below documents the framework with respect to the Bystander Campaign objectives and desired impacts on the Queensland community. These measurements provide ongoing insight and context to inform delivery and future planning.

(Source: [https://gcs.civilservice.gov.uk/guidance/evaluation/tools-and-resources/](https://gcs.civilservice.gov.uk/guidance/evaluation/tools-and-resources/))

### GCS Evaluation Framework

#### Reform Objectives
(Queenlanders take a zero tolerance approach to DFV)

#### Communication Objectives
Overall Campaign Objectives: All adult Queenslanders are active and effective bystanders in the case of DFV

Campaign Objectives: to increase: knowledge; commitment; capacity; confidence. To encourage effective intervention, with a focus on the factors that influence an individual’s decision to intervene.

#### Inputs:
What was done before and during activity
- Appropriateness of planning and design undertaken
- Content creation
- Content delivery
- Phased approach suitability

#### Outputs:
What was delivered/target audience reached
- Reach
- Frequency of exposure
- Level of added bonus value
- Dwell times
- Completion rates on viewing video content

#### System Level Impact:
The quantifiable impact at the overall strategy and the system level.
- Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to DFV.
- Changing attitudes through awareness and understanding to achieve the goal of ending violence.

#### Outcomes:
The result of activity on the target audience
- Believe they have permission to intervene
- Personal commitment to taking action
- More likely to intervene / greater confidence to intervene
- Actual intervention and choice of appropriate method
- Wider societal impact observed

#### Outtakes:
What the target audience think, feel or do
- Recall of campaign
- Engagement with campaign
- Message receipt
- Knowledge of what constitutes DFV
- Awareness of appropriate interventions
- Awareness of support services available
- Make it clear what people need to do
- Gender sensitive

*This evaluation utilises the format of the UK Government Communication Service (GCS) Evaluation Framework*

An evaluation of the planning, preparation and creative development for the Bystander Campaign identified a comprehensive and logical pathway to campaign strategy and development. Inputs have been developed using best practice approaches and learnings and are clearly linked to the Queensland Government strategy and program logic.

### Planning and Preparation
- Bystander Campaign program logic developed
- Extensive community research in 2017
- Academic literature review
- Stakeholder engagement activities
- Consortium approach with experts in the development of the campaign strategy, including with an advertising agency, MATE program, market research provider and cross-cultural advisor
- Gender sensitive approach adopted to design of campaign
- Incorporation of behaviour change theory
- Clear campaign phasing strategy and goals

### Content inputs
- Campaign materials pre-tested twice with adjustments made to approach
- Mainstream media:
  - Bystander Campaign TVCs (female and male roles portrayed)
  - Cinema, transit panels, digital illuminated panels at bus stops and city signage, convenience advertising
- Digital and social media
  - End DFV website – owned by DCSYW
  - YouTube, Facebook, Spotify, xaxis, Yahoo7, Mamamia article
- Supporting materials and content appropriate to direct action
- Appropriate and consistent linkages with resources and on-the-ground services
The campaign reached its intended audience through a multi-channel campaign strategy. Different segments of the population recalled the campaign across different channels (e.g. TV, newspaper, Facebook and other digital channels) indicating that the multi-channel strategy was inclusive and highly appropriate to engage with all age groups and other demographic groups.

Reach\(^1\)

- Target Audience Rating Points or TARPS, is a commonly used system of measuring advertising placement and audience reach. TARPS are a factor of the number of advertisements shown and the expected audience numbers based on which programs and at what time the advertising slots were purchased. Total TV TARPS exceeded the set targets through $1,860,841 in total added value and $173,003 bonus value or free placement (this level of added value is perceived by MediaCom to be a strong level of added value in contrast to other campaigns against the budget provided). Brisbane TARPS were 635 exceeding the 497 target. Other QLD TARPS were 635 exceeding the 497 target. MediaCom post-analysis and the Enhance Research post-evaluation results for TV indicate it was the strongest performing channel with a strong reach. MediaCom’s post-analysis also highlighted that the placement within State of Origin coverage was beneficial to achieving this level of reach with the campaign.
- 1,408,889 YouTube views
- 2.5 million unique users reached via digital means (excl YouTube)
- 118,669 people reached with Mamamia editorial content due to social media sharing of content by original readers to the article
- 80,895 unique page views of campaign website
- Media coverage over 194 days found 266 media items referencing the Bystander DFV campaign of which newspaper accounted for 125 items and online news for 89 items. Mainstream TV and radio collectively contained 49 media items related to the campaign.

Exposure\(^2\)

- Frequency of TV viewing outside of Brisbane exceeded targets, with 74% viewing 1+ times; Brisbane audience in target range with 68% viewing 1+ times (target 65%-70%).
- The average frequency of digital exposure (excluding YouTube) was 4.79 times.
- 89.5% of campaign website pageviews were to the landing page; with 5.5% clicking though to the ‘how to do something’ page and 4.7% clicking through to the ‘when to do something’ page.
- The audience who recalled the campaign were slightly more predisposed to identifying DFV compared to those not aware of the campaign. Among those who recalled the campaign, 16% had exposure to DFV with family/friends and 15% with neighbours in the past 6 months compared to only 11% and 10% respectively for those not aware of the campaign. This suggests that while messages are reaching those to whom it is more relevant, it is not being done at the detriment of also reaching the general Queensland population.

Engagement\(^3\)

- Well above average completion rate for videos on YouTube (45% v. 29% Govt benchmark) suggests a more engaged audience.
- The dwell time on the campaign website was on average 2min 7 sec [NB. Longer dwell time on the site compared to dwell times of the Youth Campaign of 1min 8sec]. Subsequent average dwell times on the sub-pages visited were even longer at 4min 28sec for ‘how to do something’ and 3min 23sec for ‘when to do something’. These higher than average dwell times suggest good engagement in the content of the campaign website.
- Males were particularly engaged in digital content with the MediaCom post-analysis statistics showing higher YouTube completion rates, more impressions and click on mobile ads, more clicks on Facebook ads than female activity.
- Media creative specifically took gender stereotyping concerns into account when creating gender specific campaign material. Rather than just portraying males as the perpetrators, this campaign allows males to identify with an ‘active bystander’ or ‘hero’ archtype. This is an important acknowledgement of one of the core ‘turn offs’ for a male audience when discussing DFV as identified by Deakin University's Bystanders for Primary Prevention Knowledge Paper.

\(^1\) Sources: Bystander Campaign Post Analysis Report, MediaCom; Domestic and Family Violence Bystander Campaign Evaluation 2018, Enhance Research
\(^2\) Sources: Bystander Campaign Post Analysis Report, MediaCom; Domestic and Family Violence Bystander Campaign Evaluation 2018, Enhance Research
\(^3\) Sources: Bystander Campaign Post Analysis Report, MediaCom; Khemistry Campaign Strategy, Deakin University Knowledge Paper Bystanders for Primary Prevention: a rapid review (2017)
3. Outtakes
(immediate measures)

The campaign performed well in generating presence, engaging the audience and conveying messages related to increasing personal awareness of DFV and increasing personal recognition of appropriate active bystander interventions. These outtake measures for the campaign were stronger than typically seen in other government advertising benchmarks.

Recall

- 58% prompted recall by Queenslanders across any of the Bystander Campaign materials (47% unprompted recall of ‘any’ DFV campaigns generally among the same survey audience in the post-evaluation research).

  Specific breakdown of prompted recall figures: Female TV ad (48%), Male TV ad (44%) and convenience/newsprint (26%) are the top three specifically recalled items. TV advertising was recalled at a higher level among older ages especially over 65yrs. 22% prompted recall of Facebook advertising and these recall levels were higher among 18-25yr olds and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander audience (30% and 39% respectively). The train poster advertising also had higher recall by these two audiences (22% for 18-24yr olds v. 13% for 40 to 64yr olds and 33% ATSI v. 15% non-ATSI).

- Based on comparative recall benchmarks for creative TV ads by TARPs exposure, the levels of recall for the two TVC executions are well above the anticipated norms of TARPS to recall %. At 635 TARPs for each Male and Female execution of the Bystander Campaign the normative data indicates that a recall of approximately 32% would be a typical benchmarked of average performance. The campaign achieved 48% for the Female TVC and 44% for the Male TVC and both outperformed the normative benchmark.

Engagement

- Campaign was considered important by almost all (94%) of those who recalled the campaign. This level of perceived importance is significantly higher than noted in the Youth campaign where 80% agreed that the advertising was important.

- 85% agreed that ‘the advertising got my attention’.

- 57% agreed that ‘I learnt something new from these ads’ which is higher than a comparative benchmark available for government and social specific TVCs held by Ipsos of 18%.

- Agreement was split on whether the ads are ‘relevant to them personally’ with 44% disagreeing and 26% agreeing*. However, this is highly correlated to whether the individual had previously witnessed domestic violence. 47% of those who had witnessed any form of domestic violence in the past six months agreed that the ads were ‘relevant to them personally’ (18% among those who had not witnessed DFV).

---

Sources:

*28% responded ‘neither agree nor disagree’ and 2% ‘Don’t know’
Message receipt

The message was clear and received by the audience. 96% of those aware of the campaign agreed that ‘I understood the message being delivered’. [N.B. This is higher than for the Youth Campaign at 80% total agreement at a statistically significant level].

There is some evidence of increasing awareness and understanding of behaviours that constitute domestic and family violence and that the Bystander campaign contributed to this:

- The Enhance Research post-evaluation results (charted below) showed an increase in community understanding across all types of DFV compared to awareness levels in 2017 research. Perceptions of severity of all types of DFV also increased compared to 2017 research. Those aware of the campaign all had a particularly elevated level of severity rating for all types of DFV; while those who were not aware of the campaign had a more moderate positive shift in awareness and understanding of what constitutes DFV.

- 64% of those aware of the campaign agreed ‘I am more aware of the different forms of DFV’ and this was especially high for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander audiences (71%).

There is evidence that Queenslanders are more aware of appropriate interventions regarding DFV (and that the Bystander Campaign has played a role in this):

- Those who recalled the campaign were significantly more likely to state actions such as ‘calling the police’, ‘let the victim know there is support available’, ‘encourage the victim to seek help from support services’ and ‘offer support or advice to the victim after the event’ as being something they are encouraged to do or should do in the case of both physical and non-physical DFV for both family/friends and neighbours than those who did not recall the campaign.

- 71% of those aware of the campaign self-report they are more aware of support services available. This is particularly true for females (76%) compared to males (66%).

- 65% of those aware of the campaign self-report they are more aware of different ways to intervene in DFV situations after seeing the campaign.

- The campaign website received 1,121 unique click throughs to ‘Action 2. Provide resources and help them take action’ and 482 unique click throughs to ‘Step 2. Know the support services available’ suggesting both a general interest understanding actions that can be taken related to DFV and potentially active information search related to seeking support or providing support to others.

Q8. Which of the following actions would you consider to be domestic and family violence towards a partner or family member? Source: Enhance Research Base: All respondents per wave.

Q4. How serious, in terms of domestic and family violence, do you think the following actions are? Source: Enhance Research Base: All respondents per wave.

Note: Scale has been magnified

Indicates a statistically significant change between waves
An evaluation of the outcomes indicate that the campaign has been influential in increasing recognition of personal commitment and responsibility as a bystander, and confidence in being able to identify and intervene in a suitable way.

**Commitment**

The campaign was effective in generating a greater level of personal commitment and responsibility in being an active bystander.

- 67% self-report they are more aware of their personal role in preventing DFV. This was higher, to a statistically significant degree, for females (71% compared to males 64%), for younger audiences (18-39yrs 86% compared to 40+yrs 79%) and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander viewers (81% compared to non-ATSI 68%).
- Among those who recalled the campaign, 65% self-report the campaign gives them permission by the Government to intervene (agree that the ‘ads make me feel like the Government is giving me permission to intervene’). This was even higher for those under 39 years (79%) and for LOTE audiences (72%).
- 73% agreed that “the ads will be effective in encouraging those who witness DFV to help the victims”.

**Confidence**

There is evidence that the campaign improved levels of confidence in the ability to intervene appropriately and comfort in doing so:

- Increases in stated confidence in ability to offer the right kind of help. In 2017 the total level of agreement was 48% to the statement ‘I would be confident that I would be able to offer the right kind of help to someone experiencing DFV’. The 2018 post-evaluation research showed those not aware of the campaign retained this level of agreement regarding personal confidence (49%) while those who recalled the campaign had a significantly higher level of confidence (59%).
- 42% of those who saw the campaign would feel more comfortable calling police as a result of seeing the campaign; other actions that people would feel more comfortable doing include 31% talking about DFV with family/friends, 31% talking about DFV with a victim, 28% referring to services, 28% intervening/taking some form of action, 27% looking up or searching for more information, 25% talking about the ad with family/friends.
- For all of the above measures, females aware of the campaign were more likely than males to report increased level of comfort intervening in a safe way however, as noted in prior research such as the Enhance Research 2017 community research into DFV, females are typically more likely than males to feel comfortable doing something. Males remain more reluctant generally in feeling comfortable potentially intervening except with regards to ‘talking about DFV with a perpetrator’ (15% compared to 9% among females). Gender specific results on the increased level of comfort are displayed in the chart.

However, there exist many barriers that still require addressing in future campaigns to take these improvements in self-efficacy and translate them into a willingness to act.

- The post-campaign survey showed a statistically significant reduction in personal concern (down to 63% would be concerned about what might happen to me if I was to intervene from 67% in 2017). However, despite this statistically significant shift this level of personal concern is still a barrier for a substantial proportion of Queenslanders.
- The Enhance Research post-evaluation results show that 72% of Queenslanders still agree that ‘most people turn a blind eye to or ignore DFV’ indicative of an ongoing societal challenge where people will have a tendency to rely on the public and common behaviour of others to identify the societal norm regarding intervening (compared to 71% in 2017).
- The post-evaluation research also shows that agreement remains high that ‘victims are responsible for leaving relationships if they are experiencing DFV’ (52% compared to 50% in 2017) and agreement is stable that ‘DFV is a private matter to be handled within the family’ (13% compared to 12% in 2017). These consistently held perceptions remained stable across the years and were no different between those who had seen the Bystander Campaign or not suggesting that the Bystander campaign had limited influence on the attitudes and beliefs underpinning a lack of action.
4. Outcomes

(what was the result) cont.

There is some evidence that the campaign may have had a small impact on some individuals in getting them to intervene.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At an overall Queensland population level there is no direct evidence of campaign influence specifically leading to a decrease in ‘doing nothing’ after seeing or hearing a DFV incident. However, there is evidence that the campaign may be having some impact that is not yet able to be discerned at a population level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 31% of those who have taken bystander action in relation to witnessing a DFV incident in the past six months and had seen the campaign (approximately 13% of the Queensland population) said they were influenced to do so in part by having seen the campaign. Although numbers are small, this translates into a 45% increase in intervention which may not have occurred if the campaign had not been conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Among those who were aware of the campaign, 57% agreed ‘I have a stronger intention to intervene in a DFV incident’. However, given this is a self-reported metric it should not be used as a strong diagnostic measure in isolation of the other findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall, 36% of those who saw the campaign self-classified as doing something after seeing the campaign; with 17% taking very specific action to intervene or engage with victims and perpetrators (as opposed to general discussion or information seeking). This overall level of ‘doing something’ (36%) is not as high as noted for the Youth Campaign (51%) and also included activities that were beyond direct intervention in a DFV situation. Specifically 16% ‘talked about DFV with family/friends’, 14% ‘talked about the ad with family/friends’, 10% ‘looked up or searched for further information about DFV’, 9% ‘liked, commented or shared a post on social media about DFV’, 7% ‘talked about DFV with a victim’ and 5% ‘called the police after witnessing a DFV incident’. It is possible that these wider actions generated from seeing the campaign may assist in encouraging future bystander action or supporting the overall intent of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2016-2026).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another core outcome from the campaign was to ensure that when intervention occurred that appropriate actions were taken for the safety of all involved. In the 2018 campaign post-evaluation research, Queenslanders who did something after observing DFV with family/friends were most likely to offer support/advice to the victim (46%), encouraged victim to seek help from a support service (45%) or let the victim know that support is available (42%). Common actions for DFV involving neighbours and strangers were focused on calling the police (40% and 32% respectively) or offering support/advice to the victim (15% both).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the campaign post-evaluation research, there were a only a few significant differences in actions taken by people who intervened and had been aware of the campaign compared to those who intervened yet had not seen the campaign:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DFV with family/friends: more likely to ‘speak to victim to try and stop it’ (36% compared to 18% of those who acted but did not see campaign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DFV with neighbours: more likely to ‘speak to the perpetrator to try and stop it’ (16% compared to 5% of those who acted but did not see campaign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enhance Research post-evaluation results suggest that while the campaign appears to have had an impact on the potential behaviour of individuals with respect to their own beliefs and attitudes; the majority surveyed still believe that most Queenslanders are passive bystanders. Societal norms do not shift easily, 72% of post-evaluation research respondents still agreed that ‘most people turn a blind eye to DFV’ compared to 71% in 2017. Theory of Change models for bystander action suggest that societal norms also need to change, otherwise their influence will outweigh individuals internalised intentions to intervene and reinforce passive bystander behaviour culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Domestic and Family Violence Bystander Campaign Evaluation 2018, Enhance Research
The Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Engagement and Communication Strategy takes deliberate and diverse approaches to changing attitudes and behaviours towards DFV. Only by first changing attitudes held by society through awareness and understanding can the goal of ending violence be realised. The long term goal is for Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to DFV. The Bystander Campaign was concerned with awareness raising. That is, educating the community to recognise DFV and the need to act. It is unlikely that, at this point in the overall communications strategy, system level impacts such as attitudes held by society (which suggest changes in behaviour) associated with the campaign will shift. It is, however, important to monitor system level impacts over time to ensure the communication campaign’s contribution to the long term goal is achieved.

The GCS Evaluation Framework used to evaluate the Bystander Campaign, builds in logic and is cyclic in nature. All findings from outputs, outtakes and outcomes through to system level impacts build incrementally, ultimately building the case for progress towards the reform objectives. This cyclic influence should help to inform future campaigns to continually build awareness, knowledge, intention, action and advocacy.

Longer term impacts are not anticipated at this early stage of the Bystander Campaign. In addition, as the campaign creative executions did not specifically direct viewers to one central point of contact or one specific action, it is difficult to measure any higher level impacts. For these reasons, the extent to which Bystander Campaign contributes to system level impacts to achieve the broader Reform Objectives that “Queenslanders take zero tolerance approach to DFV” has not been evaluated.

At such an early stage in the Bystander Campaign there is limited external and internal data to clearly understand the system level impacts that contribute to the reform objective. Survey data used to evidence outcomes of the campaign, measures bystander awareness, knowledge and intentions to intervene, which is only a proxy for actual behaviour should the situation arise. Where survey data does exist for those who recall being a bystander, it is either a small sample, or not contextualised to understand if an appropriate intervention occurred, noting what constitute ‘appropriate’ will differ by context and is therefore difficult to measure.

The measures of Queensland society beliefs and attitudes that are relevant with the Bystander Campaign and measured within the post-evaluation research conducted by Enhance Research are those that demonstrate that people believe that no one turns a blind eye to DFV, feeling confident to intervene and that it is not primarily the victim’s responsibility for leaving domestic and family violence contexts.
Overall the Bystander Campaign was a well planned, implemented and executed campaign. It helped to achieve increases in knowledge, commitment, capacity and confidence at a personal level.

Key success factors include:

- A very clear campaign development pathway which utilised all available resources (DFV Prevention and Engagement strategy and campaign logic, expert consultants, prior community research on DFV in Queensland, prior Bystander campaigns conducted domestically and internationally) to leverage elements and identify messages that were highly relevant.
- Appropriate adjustment of campaign concepts based upon the pre-testing of the concepts created and consultation with a consortium of experts.
- A multi-media approach that sought to engage a wide population audience through channels that were most relevant to them (older audience tended to engage via television and newspaper while the younger audience tended to engage via digital and Facebook). Particular strengths of this a multi-media approach:
  - Large male TV audience viewing during State of Origin, coordinated approach across media personalities and content and personal environment delivery (i.e. washrooms) all effective in engaging different audiences.
  - Timing of the campaign to coincide with Queensland’s DFV month.
- Use of a male actor in the creative in a positive manner (actively doing something) to help avoid criticism that males are always portrayed as the perpetrator and to demonstrate that both males and females have a positive role to play when it comes to DFV.

Gaps:

- Although it was appropriate to simplify the messaging of the Bystander Campaign, in doing so some of the original intended campaign strategies such as ‘addressing barriers’ and ‘providing tailored messages’ were no longer core objectives. The goals of addressing barriers to intervening and providing tailored messages to different audiences and for different intervention actions are relevant to consider in the future. Behaviour change models of all types recognise that barriers such as concern about intervening and perceptions that ‘most’ people turn a blind eye to DFV need to be reduced or outweighed by motivating factors in order to produce a change of behaviour.

such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, people with disability and those in regional and remote areas can experience and perceive DFV in a different manner to others. The ability to tailor messages and creative campaigns to be relevant to varying sub-groups produces a greater capability for messages to be received by these audiences.

- One of Queensland Government’s intermediate outcomes to achieving a zero tolerance approach to DFV is that ‘Queenslanders understand all types of DFV are unacceptable’. While all campaigns including Bystander consistently convey that DFV is ‘not okay’ and ‘serious’ it is subtle in its emphasis. There may be a need to specifically focus on messaging and wording surrounding the term ‘unacceptable’ or similar direct language.

Insights:

- There is opportunity for the campaign to evolve further along the original goals including:
  - Tailored messaging
  - Reduction in barriers
  - Societal and peer norms
- MediaCom recommended that in order to avoid fatigue of messaging that frequency recaps and refresh of Facebook creative be considered.
- Based on the post-evaluation research, Enhance Research recommended that future campaigns offer people who are bystanders more direct examples of what they can do to offer emotional support and encouragement to seek help. The Enhance Research suggests this is relevant to male bystanders in particular. The recommendations also highlighted that any future campaign phases could include non-physical forms of DFV to reduce ambiguity around whether these constitute DFV.
- The literature supports a Theory of Change model where external influences such as social norms and peers either enable or inhibit bystander behaviour. To effectively challenge external influences on bystander behaviour, future communications could include campaign collateral that clearly demonstrates that bystander intervention is supported by peers and members of their community.
One example is a Bystander Campaign that ran in the Northern Territory several years ago which showed a group of people at a bus stop that can hear a domestic incident occurring at a neighbouring house. Reassuring looks and gestures of agreement are exchanged between the group of commuters and the one bystander who calls the Police. The message was clear that the social norm was to report the incident, and that peers would approve of the action.

Insights for ongoing evaluation

- **Additional measures** – Evaluation of the Bystander campaigns could consider additional measures for social norms and ask in more detail the types of behaviours that constitute appropriate intervention either by themselves or others in certain circumstances. This would help to better evidence the Theory of Change model. It would also provide valuable benchmark data to be used for future campaigns which may build on awareness, knowledge and intention to action and advocacy.

- **Measuring social norms** – The Bystander Campaign has attempted to change individual beliefs and measures self-efficacy beliefs and their change, but comparatively there are less considerations for beliefs about the social environment which are central to the understanding of social norms. Beliefs about what others do, and what others think we should do, within some reference group, maintained by social approval and disapproval, often guide a person’s actions in their social setting. Educational campaigns alone are rarely enough to challenge the underlying social norms that contribute to certain behaviours. In order to assist measuring these social norms, QSS measurement could be expanded to include broader social norm measures in addition to its measurement of knowledge and behaviour. The post-evaluation research could expand upon the societal norms already measured to also incorporate measurement of peer group influence, believe that interventions may be ineffective or endanger the victim and assumptions that instances observed may just be a misread situation.

- **Intervention measures** – Currently it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding actual bystander intervention. The measurement is quite complex (measuring all types of DFV in all sorts of contexts both intended and actual behaviour). In addition the range of actions reported include minor, major, safe or unsafe interventions meaning a single understanding of whether the rate of appropriate intervention is increasing or not is difficult to understand let alone measure. Although it is acknowledged that this level of complexity exists in measurement; the manner in which results are constructed, reported and the provision of overall statistics could be reviewed to assist those using the evaluation data to be clearer on how success or otherwise can be evidenced.

- **Understanding ‘confidence’** – Future evaluations should consider appropriateness of wording for measuring ‘confident’ in the context of domestic violence. i.e. A person may increase their level of ‘confidence’ in being able to take appropriate action however may never feel ‘comfortable’ doing so because it is an uncomfortable action/topic/discussion. The research evaluation questions monitoring comfort levels could be changed to measure ‘confidence’ in line with the broader measures of attitudinal statements and behaviours.
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Appendix S: Definitions of analysis techniques used in the review

S.1 Introduction
This report uses a number of analysis techniques to better understand the behaviour of data. This appendix provides an overview of these techniques to better equip the reader to understand the analysis being undertaken throughout this report.

S.2 Box plots
Box plots are used throughout this report when a comparison of the distribution of two variables provides as much value as a comparison of the central tendency (mean or median value) of two variables. This analysis is particularly relevant for survey results, where the distribution around the median indicates the degree of consensus or divergent views among a group of survey participants.

*Outliers are not included in a box chart. Outliers are identified as any value below the minimum or above the maximum by 1.5 x Inter-quartile range.*
S.3 Correlation analysis

Correlation analysis is used throughout this report to measure the degree to which variables move together. Co-movements of variables can be indications of relationships between variables. However, it is important to note that these tests do not assign causality to the relationship, and do not provide conclusive evidence that variables are related (cannot identify spurious relationships).

A correlation test produces a correlation coefficient that takes the value of between -1 and +1. A coefficient value of +1 indicates that two variables are perfectly and positively correlated (variables move perfectly together). A coefficient value of -1 indicates that two variables are perfectly and negatively correlated (variables are perfectly inverse). There are two types of correlation analysis used throughout this report:

- **Pearson correlation**: When continuous variables (variables that have an infinite number of possible values – or behave in that manner) are analysed, a Pearson correlation test is used. This test requires that the variables being analysed have a normal (bell-shaped) distribution.

- **Spearman rank correlation**: When ordinal variables (variables that have limited possible values and have a natural order – such as Likert scale variables) are analysed, a Spearman rank correlation test is used. This test does not make any assumptions about the distribution of the variables.

S.4 Hypothesis tests: Comparison of means analysis

Comparison of means analysis between two groups of variables is used throughout this report. A comparison of means analysis is used to determine if the means of two separate groups of variables are different, or if these differences could have occurred ‘by chance’. There are two types of hypothesis tests used throughout this report:

- **T-test**: When continuous variables (variables that have an infinite number of possible values – or behave in that manner) are analysed, a t-test is used. This test requires that the variables being analysed have a normal (bell-shaped) distribution and groups are considered independent.

- **Kruskal-Wallis H test**: When ordinal variables (variables that have limited possible values and have a natural order – such as Likert scale variables) are analysed, a Kruskal-Wallis H test is used. This test does not make any assumptions about the distribution of the variables.
Appendix T : Survey approach and characteristics

T.1  Introduction
This appendix presents the descriptive statistics of the surveys undertaken by Deloitte Access Economics as part of the primary research activities in scope for the review.

T.2  Implementing Agency Survey 2019
The Implementing Agency Survey 2019 was designed and fielded by Deloitte Access Economics throughout the month of March 2019. The aim of the survey was to understand the views of implementing agency staff on the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation process of the Second Action Plan. The survey was distributed to each agency involved in the implementation of the Second Action Plan. Characteristics of survey participants are summarised in Figure S.1.

Figure S.1 Descriptive statistics of survey participants of the Implementing Agency Survey 2019

---

**Survey responses**

- Total number of unique survey attempts: 83
- Number of unique completed surveys: 58

**Organisational role**

- Executives (SO and above): 27%
- Mid-level (AO5 to AO6): 13%
- Graduate (AO3 to AO4): 7%
- Senior (AO7 to AO8): 50%
- Other: specify: 4%

**Agency representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Survey Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QAS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIR</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSBA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCDSS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATSIP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHPW</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNRME</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDMIP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJAG</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project team characteristics**

- 54% Survey participants within a project team
- 46% Survey participants not within a project team

*Survey participants were asked to identify the level of involvement that they had with the implementation of The Strategy

**Organisational role: project team vs non-project team members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational role</th>
<th>Project Team Members</th>
<th>Non-Project Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Service Provider Survey 2019

The Service Provider Survey 2019 was designed and fielded by Deloitte Access Economics throughout the month of February 2019. The aim of the survey was to understand the views of service providers on the impacts of the Second Action Plan on its provision of services and outcomes of victim survivors and perpetrators. The survey was distributed to service providers across Queensland with a contract with the Queensland Government. Characteristics of survey participants are summarised in Figure S.2.

Figure S.2 Descriptive statistics of survey participants of the Service Provider Survey 2019

- **Survey responses**
  - Total number of unique surveys attempts: 35
  - Number of unique completed surveys: 24

- **Location of work**
  - Number of survey participants: 35
  - Survey participants could select more than one category to describe the location of operations

- **Service Users**
  - Number of survey participants: 24
  - Survey participants could select more than one category to describe the users of their services. Both refers to perpetrators and victims

- **Types of services provided**
  - Number of survey participants: 24
  - Survey participants could select more than one category to describe the types of services provided

*Survey participants could select more than one category to describe the location of operations
*Survey participants could select more than one category to describe the users of their services. Both refers to perpetrators and victims
*Survey participants could select more than one category to describe the types of services provided
### Appendix U: Summary findings

#### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Service Sector</th>
<th>Victim Survivors</th>
<th>Perpetrators</th>
<th>Primary and secondary data collection</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with senior executives</td>
<td>Survey of funded domestic and family violence service providers (n = 26)</td>
<td>Observation of DFVI Council Open Conversation Event</td>
<td>Interviews through case studies</td>
<td>Case studies used to highlight specific actions under the Second Action Plan (n = 12)</td>
<td>NNNE Recommendation implementation updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews during case studies</td>
<td>Interviews with service providers through case studies</td>
<td>Interviews through case studies</td>
<td>Extracts drawn from existing evaluations and reports</td>
<td>Administrative data collected against the evaluation framework indicator matrix</td>
<td>NNNE Recommendation closure reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Social Survey data</td>
<td>Governance meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Progress to date has been commendable

**To what extent was the Second Action Plan implemented as intended and what have we learned from implementation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changing community attitudes &amp; behaviours</th>
<th>Integrating service responses</th>
<th>Strengthening justice system responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus to date has been on increasing knowledge of what behaviours constitute domestic and family violence. The review considers this to be appropriate given theoretical models of behaviour change argue that knowledge creation is a necessary pre-cursor to attitude and behaviour change</td>
<td>Focus has been, and continues to be, on the roll out and implementation of the Integrated Service Response trials, as well as improving victim survivors’ access to essential services (e.g., health and housing services)</td>
<td>Focus has been on the justice system holding perpetrators to account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foundational work has occurred to enable system responses that support perpetrators to take responsibility for their behaviour and stop using violence (e.g., review of practice standards, roll-out of programs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Examples of what has been implemented

- Communication and Engagement Strategy (2016 – 2026)
  - Communication Campaigns for youth, bystanders, Elder Abuse and individuals seeking support
  - The RREP is available to all schools in Queensland
- Integrated Service Response trials in three sites (urban, regional and discrete community)
- Delivered new or enhanced domestic and family violence specialist services
- Domestic and family violence relevant resources and training embedded in hospitals and emergency departments
- Established Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Courts
- Strengthened the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012
- Employed additional specialist police officers to respond to domestic and family violence

#### Status of Actions under the Second Action Plan

- 61 delivered
- 23 commenced

Where actions were implemented more slowly than intended, this was often to engage in information gathering, resolve complexities and deliver superior outcomes.

#### Total number of actions

- Total number of actions: 35
  - Foundational element 1: 22 (97% Delivered, 3% Commenced)
  - Foundational element 2: 27 (32% Delivered, 68% Commenced)
  - Foundational element 3: 56 (44% Delivered, 56% Commenced)

It is important to recognise that some actions are perpetual in nature and achieving the desired outcome can require ongoing support by agencies.

#### Section Action Plan actions grouped by type of action
Enablers

- **Leadership**: the reforms led by the Premier and Minister has effectively signalled the importance of the Strategy and overall implementation of the Second Action Plan.
- **Collaboration**: agencies were responsible to Ministers and each other, this enabled a focus to help achieve the outcomes sought through the Strategy. Collaborative approaches can be formal (e.g., embedded officers, regular working group meetings) and spontaneous where agencies rally around a problem and/or there are existing relationships.
- **DFVI Council**: the governance arrangement has been an effective mechanism to ensure collaboration at senior levels, as well as providing oversight and accountability, independent of government.
- **Innovation**: innovative approaches and flexibility have been demonstrated in some of the case studies and pilots, such as the online DV1 form (DJAG) and innovation workshops to identify solutions to address wallists for perpetrator programs (CDV1). Innovative approaches enable flexibility to design responses that are appropriate for the particular context.

Barriers

- **Attitudes towards implementation**: while some agencies appear to recognise the perpetual nature of actions, others were keen to categorise actions as delivered at times appearing as compliance based. Attitudes may impact opportunities for refinement and sustainability, and ultimately the extent to which the intent of the action (and broader Strategy) is achieved.
- **Inconsistent supporting infrastructure**, including regulatory, legislative and other supporting infrastructure that differs across jurisdictions or agencies. For example, failure to appropriately share information is a barrier to integrated service responses, particularly for victim survivors.
- **Workforce capability**: insufficient staffing or lack of an appropriately skilled workforce has been cited as a barrier. For example, the mainstream domestic and family violence service sector may encounter workforce capability challenges in responding to the needs of vulnerable population groups.
- **Staff buy-in**: staff buy-in emerged as a barrier throughout consultations and the Implementing Agency Survey (2019). This can create a barrier to implementation, particularly where this occurs at senior levels.
- **Prioritisation of reform activities**: Conflicting priorities emerged as a barrier to implementation, with 26% of survey respondents to the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) identifying conflicting priorities as a barrier to implementation – which increased to 40% among executives. This was supported by in case studies and interviews with implementing agencies.
- **Funding/resource allocation**: 39% of survey respondents to the Implementing Agency Survey (2019) identified a lack of funding or resources as a significant barrier to implementation, as did many service providers in the Service Provider Survey (2019).

Outcomes

**What has been achieved to date and where there are opportunities to continue to improve?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Outcome 1: Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question</strong>: To what extent do Queenslanders take a zero tolerance approach to domestic and family violence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Queenslanders understand all types of domestic and family violence are unacceptable</strong></td>
<td>Increased Queenslanders are aware of the different types of domestic and family violence</td>
<td>Knowledge – there are high levels of knowledge of domestic and family violence and this has been sustained. It is likely to be too early to observe changes at a population level. Overall, up to 93% of Queenslanders understood that all six types of abuse presented in the QSS are domestic and family violence. This remained unchanged from 2017.</td>
<td>Use of a more targeted approach to increase knowledge and understanding of the seriousness of some forms of domestic and family violence may be required, e.g. non-physical types, including psychological abuse, technology-facilitated abuse and financial abuse. For a small proportion of the population, there is a gap between the knowledge of what behaviour constitutes domestic and family violence and the seriousness of this behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Queenslanders indicate that all types of domestic and family violence are unacceptable</td>
<td>Overall, up to 90% of Queenslanders understand that all types of domestic and family violence are serious. There are still lower perceived levels of seriousness for certain types of domestic and family violence including verbal and psychological abuse, harassment over electronic communications and financial control compared to physical and sexual abuse and threats and intimidation. This remained unchanged from 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Victims and perpetrators know where to go for help</strong></td>
<td>Increased percentage of victims who know where to access help</td>
<td>Knowledge – police referrals have increased. During 2017-18, the QPS submitted 61,685 referral reports for at-risk individuals to support services, up from 52,600 in 2016-17. The Victim Crime Survey (2018) estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The summary of evaluation findings under each supporting outcome is based on the draft Structured Review delivered on 01 April 2019. Intermediate outcomes and indicators that are coloured grey are not reported in the review to date due to unavailability of data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for domestic and family violence support/advice/help to women's and men's lines</td>
<td>76.0% of domestic and family violence victim survivors were satisfied with police domestic and family violence referrals, up from 70.4% in 2016.</td>
<td>Knowledge - the number of DVConnect clients has risen. The number of DVConnect clients is a proxy indicator of the degree to which Queenslanders are reaching out for support. This analysis requires cautious interpretation as calling DVConnect is just one avenue for help seeking behaviour and a limitation exists in this data where it cannot be determined how many did not seek help due to domestic and family violence.</td>
<td>There is some evidence that DVConnect clients who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people or from CALD backgrounds who are increasing in their representativeness, as determined by their increasing share of total DVConnect clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of perpetrators who voluntarily access perpetrator programs or related services</td>
<td>While the data shows that that DVConnect clients are increasing across geographical regions, anecdotally, victims and perpetrators, particularly in some rural and regional communities are reporting that they do not know where to access domestic and family violence services or how to access these services.</td>
<td>Knowledge – the number of perpetrators who voluntarily access perpetrator programs is increasing. In 2017-18 there were 15,184 service users, up from 5,970 service users in 2015-16.</td>
<td>Most service providers who participated in the Service Provider Survey identified that perpetrator support and behaviour-change programs are insufficient to meet client demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage of bystanders who are prepared to respond to domestic and family violence</td>
<td>Behaviour – while more than half of all bystanders have taken action, 40% did not do anything after becoming aware of domestic and family violence involving a neighbour in 2018. Bystanders are more likely to respond based on the closeness of their relationship with the victim survivor or perpetrator. They are more likely to respond to physical domestic and family violence than non-physical domestic and family violence. There are also notable variations between the different population groups in their willingness to get involved in non-physical domestic and family violence. A limitation is that this reflects actual actions, and not whether the action undertaken was an appropriate response. The evaluation findings from the bystander communication strategy show some improvements in the awareness of domestic and family violence and self-related capability to respond to domestic and family violence of those that were exposed to the campaign.</td>
<td>Behaviour – while more than half of all bystanders have taken action, 40% did not do anything after becoming aware of domestic and family violence involving a neighbour in 2018. Bystanders are more likely to respond based on the closeness of their relationship with the victim survivor or perpetrator. They are more likely to respond to physical domestic and family violence than non-physical domestic and family violence. There are also notable variations between the different population groups in their willingness to get involved in non-physical domestic and family violence. A limitation is that this reflects actual actions, and not whether the action undertaken was an appropriate response.</td>
<td>An evaluation report of the Bystander Campaign, conducted by Ipsos in January 2019, identifies an opportunity for the campaign to continue to evolve in subsequent phases. This includes further consideration of tailored messaging and societal and peer norms. (Bystander Campaign Flagship Evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage of bystanders who understand how to safely intervene</td>
<td>Attitudes – more than 76% of Queenslanders value a culture that respects gender equality. There has been a decline in the proportion of Queenslanders who value a culture that respects gender equality between 2017 and 2018. Further, in response to the statement ‘Women prefer a man to be in charge of the relationship’, 58.3% of Queenslanders responded ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’, with the notion of a male-dominant role not preferred in a domestic relationship in 2018. This has seen a statistically significant decline from 63.3% in 2017.</td>
<td>Attitudes – more than 76% of Queenslanders value a culture that respects gender equality. There has been a decline in the proportion of Queenslanders who value a culture that respects gender equality between 2017 and 2018. Further, in response to the statement ‘Women prefer a man to be in charge of the relationship’, 58.3% of Queenslanders responded ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’, with the notion of a male-dominant role not preferred in a domestic relationship in 2018. This has seen a statistically significant decline from 63.3% in 2017.</td>
<td>There is an opportunity to do more to encourage positive perceptions towards gender equality across Queensland. This could be explored in future communications activities of the Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage of Queenslanders believe it is important to change our culture</td>
<td>Measured through supporting outcome 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Bystanders take appropriate and safe action to prevent domestic and family violence

1.4 Queenslanders understand the reason and need for cultural change

1.5 The Queensland community works together to prevent domestic and family violence
### Supporting Outcome 2: Respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour are embedded in our community

**Research Question:** Are respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour embedded in our community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Schools embed respectful relationships and gender equality within their school community</strong></td>
<td>Increased understanding in students of positive, equal, respectful relationships</td>
<td>In May–June 2018, 368 of 1,240 Queensland state schools reported they were implementing DoE's RREP. A case study focused on respectful relationships education identified that leadership and dedicated support for implementation are essential to embedding respectful relationships and growing staff capability.</td>
<td>An evaluation of the implementation of respectful relationships education in 10 pilot schools is due to report in 2019. It is expected to identify further learnings and opportunities regarding progress and outcome to embed respectful relationships in the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Schools have the capacity to implement respectful relationships education</strong></td>
<td>Increased capacity of students to recognise and challenge gender stereotypes and roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Parents and school staff value the teaching of respectful relationships education</strong></td>
<td>Increased positive views indicating value of providing respectful relationships education in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Students display increased respectful relationships and behaviours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 The broader community values respectful relationships and non-violent behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Outcome 3: Queensland community, business, religious, sporting and all government leaders are taking action and working together

**Research Question:** To what extent are Queensland community, business, religious, sporting, and all government leaders taking action and working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Cultural change is led by communities across Queensland, working together to protect and support</strong></td>
<td>Queenslanders’ involvement in community initiatives related to domestic and family violence</td>
<td>Based on QSS, approximately 8% of Queenslanders were involved in domestic and family violence prevention initiatives in 2018.</td>
<td>There is an opportunity to do more to encourage positive perceptions towards gender equality across Queensland. This could be explored in future communications activities of the Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is an opportunity to do more to engage and empower diverse populations to protect and support victims and model respectful relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcomes</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victims and model respectful relationships</td>
<td>Number of community initiatives that support awareness and early intervention for domestic and family violence</td>
<td>There were 75 registered events for domestic and family violence prevention month in 2017-18. In addition, there were 35 successful grant recipients of the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month Grant program – 13 of which were specifically targeting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Events funded typically received a higher dollar value and attracted more participants than in previous years, particularly in regional locations across Queensland. Community-led initiatives appear most likely to occur where there are identified leaders who recognise domestic and family violence as an important issue. The review identified some examples of community-led initiatives that were implemented to overcome gaps in service delivery, particularly where existing services were not considered culturally appropriate or meeting the needs of diverse population groups.</td>
<td>There is an opportunity to take the learnings from existing community led initiatives and use these to consider similar approaches in other regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Queensland Police Service promote cultural change in the broader Queensland community</td>
<td>Community satisfaction with the police response to domestic and family violence</td>
<td>In 2018, an estimated 60.7% (66.5% in 2016) of victims of domestic and family violence were satisfied with police services related to DVO breaches, 70.8% (71.3% in 2016) were satisfied with services related to domestic and family violence applications, and 76.0% (70.4% in 2016) were satisfied with services related to domestic and family violence referrals. No changes are statistically significant. The QPS State-wide Coordinator case study noted that QPS has embarked on a journey to progress internal cultural change with an acknowledgement that ongoing efforts are required to sustain the change. As such, work is underway to develop a Cultural Change Program aimed at balancing the expectations of the community with the need to effectively police domestic and family violence. The intent of this work is to involve the workforce in the change process.</td>
<td>There is evidence that police responses are more supportive of victim survivors as police referrals have increase (see IO 1.2). Consultations identified that in some areas, there is a gap between the cultural diversity within the Queensland Police Service potentially impacting the understanding of appropriate responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Leaders across the community, business, faiths, sport and government participate in driving reform, embrace changes and innovation within their own organisations that better protect and support victims and model respectful relationships</td>
<td>Increased percentage of participating organisations that report changes in policy and/or approaches to domestic and family violence</td>
<td>In pockets across Queensland, there is emerging evidence of local leaders demonstrating leadership and commitment over community-led initiatives to prevent domestic and family violence. A benefit of local leadership observed through the review is the capacity to tailor responses to local needs and to share resources and learning across diverse community groups.</td>
<td>More information is needed to understand how best to identify and support leaders to drive reform within their own organisations. DCSYW is currently exploring opportunities to engage and empower leaders from a diverse range of private sector agencies to prevent and respond to domestic and family violence. Strategies for scaling local examples of initiatives will be important so that the Strategy can transition to becoming community owned and embedded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased number of partnerships between government and non-government organisations to prevent domestic and family violence</td>
<td>Government plays an important role in facilitating action among businesses, local government and community organisations by providing a trusted and authoritative source of information to change policies, challenge attitudes and promote awareness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supporting Outcome 4: Queensland workplaces and workforce challenge attitudes contributing to violence and effectively support workers

#### Research Question: Do Queensland workplaces and workforce challenge attitudes to contributing to violence and effectively support workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Workplaces</strong></td>
<td>Participation of Queensland Government departments in domestic and family violence prevention-related external accreditation programs</td>
<td><strong>Government is taking a leadership role</strong> in implementing domestic and family violence support policies, with commitment to changing culture through increases in engagement in domestic and family violence training, initiatives and White Ribbon Accreditation (WRA). Currently all Queensland government departments are WRA workplaces as of May 2019 WRA. For the private sector, it is estimated that 20 private sector organisations operating in Queensland have WRA. Further, results from the 2018 QSS show that 36% of Queenslanders work in workplaces that have engaged in at least one initiative in the last 12 months. In addition, the percentage of WGEA reporting companies that had a domestic and family violence policy and/or strategy in place has increased from 42.4% in 2016-17 to 48.6% in 2017-18. Progress is being made in private sector organisations, however this tends to be focused on large, well-resourced organisations. There are also a number of organisations that do not see domestic and family violence policies as a priority of need.</td>
<td>The government has an opportunity to improve domestic and family violence supportive programs in non-government organisations by increasing the knowledge/incentives of why these programs should be a priority and assisting smaller organisations who do not have sufficient resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Employee awareness of domestic and family violence related support</strong></td>
<td>Increased awareness of Queensland Government departmental employees of domestic and family violence workplace support policy</td>
<td><strong>Government agencies have increased the awareness levels of domestic and family violence support among their employees.</strong> In 2017, an average of 76% of public sector employees who responded to the WQ survey reported being aware of domestic and family violence support policies at their workplace. Agencies with WRA tend to have higher awareness levels of domestic and family violence support programs compared to those without WRA (80.9% vs 73.8%).</td>
<td>More training may be required for agencies, particularly targeting those involved in service response. It is critical for government agencies to acknowledge challenges associated with training a large workforce and their role in responding to domestic and family violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 Building capability to recognise signs of domestic and family violence, and respond and refer appropriately, to better support affected employees</strong></td>
<td>Increased number and percentage of Queensland Government departmental employees who have undertaken online domestic and family violence awareness raising programs</td>
<td>As of November 2018, there were 12,349 users of online training websites, 75% of which had completed training. <strong>There are signs that culture within Queensland workplaces is changing.</strong> Government agencies have increased their self-reported confidence levels in identifying, supporting and referring colleagues who are affected by domestic and family violence. According to the WQF survey, in 2018, on average 9.2% of staff members reported they had responded to a colleague affected by domestic and family violence, a growth of 0.8% since 2017. Further, WRA accredited agencies reported greater confidence in appropriately responding to employees affected by domestic and family violence, compared to those in non-WRA accredited agencies</td>
<td>Training completions across departments vary. Particularly, there appeared to be a lower number of online training completion in larger organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased confidence of Queensland Government departmental employees in responding appropriately to domestic and family violence</td>
<td><strong>Domestic and family violence-related support provided by employee assistance providers to Queensland Government departmental employees and managers</strong></td>
<td><strong>There has been an increase in domestic and family violence-related support provided by EAPs in government and non-government workplaces.</strong> In 2017-18, there were 37 EAP appointments made by Queensland Government employees when domestic and family violence is listed as the primary reason since 2014-15. Further, 85% of all WGEA non-government organisations provided domestic and family violence-related EAP services in 2017-18. Regional consultations have highlighted that a high turnover of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
staff has resulted in a significant amount of time being consumed on the training and retraining of staff in rural and remote areas, inhibiting the ability to continually strengthen and build the workforce capabilities in these areas.

### Supporting Outcome 5: Victims and their families are safe and supported

**Research Question:** To what extent are victims and their families safe and supported?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Service responses are culturally appropriate and meet the needs of victims</strong></td>
<td>Number of people whose housing needs are met</td>
<td>Overall, service providers are generally positive in terms of the contribution of the domestic and family violence reforms toward a range of service system indicators for victim survivors, including access to and uptake of services.</td>
<td>Despite service providers’ positive perception of the contribution of the domestic and family violence reforms toward a range of service system indicators for victim survivors, there is an opportunity for further actions to ensure this translates into improved feelings of safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of domestic and family violence counselling service users with cases closed/finalised as a result of the majority of identified needs being met</td>
<td>DCSYW administrative data shows the number of counselling service users with closed cases increased by 34% between 2015-16 and 2017-18 due to all needs being met. Further, consultations with regional workers highlighted that integrated service responses in regional and rural are increasingly becoming more culturally appropriate, due to the implementation of community co-designed responses, there is however still more progress to be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2 Victims experience integrated service delivery across service providers through improved information sharing</strong></td>
<td>Proportion of multiagency safety plans closed after actions finalised</td>
<td>Referrals to crisis accommodation has remained high and stable between 2015-16 and 2017-18. Justice system responses are discussed in more detail in supporting outcome seven. Specific initiatives like the Southport Specialist domestic and family violence Court, which are victim survivor-focused, appear to be creating a positive experience for victim survivors. Further, collaborative efforts, and increased information sharing in rural and remote regions, between government agencies such as DATSIP, HRT teams, the service sector and communities has enabled responses to increasingly become more culturally appropriate, an increase in victim referrals is a reflection of this.</td>
<td>Opportunity exists to further incorporate responses that support victim survivors over the medium to long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of victim referrals where contact with the victim occurred: a/ domestic and family violence b/ Sexual assault</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are indications of increasing demand for post-crisis services, including brokerage funding, accommodation and counselling services. There is an opportunity to further investigate whether there are sufficient resources within the sector to meet this demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3 Victims have access to appropriate support services and services are responsive</strong></td>
<td>Number of people supported to access crisis accommodation or housing appropriate to their needs</td>
<td>Approximately 90% of referrals complete for crisis accommodation were completed within 24 hours. However, there have been increases in the average length of time taken to allocate transitional housing, government managed housing and long-term community housing.</td>
<td>Flexible funding options is one idea to better support victims, and is reflected in more victims accessing brokerage funding and success stories from funding to pursue education to support long-term recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people whose housing needs are met in a timely way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4 Services protect and help victims and their families rebuild their lives</strong></td>
<td>Number of DV counselling clients who have been provided with brokerage for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lives, gain independence and avoid re-victimisation</td>
<td>safety upgrades to the homes of victims</td>
<td>In 2017-18, there were 1,196 domestic and family violence counselling clients who have been provided with brokerage for safety upgrades to their homes in 2017-18, up from 602 in 2015-16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage of victims assessed by the HRT as having improved safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Service Provider Survey (n=26) contains a question in relation to whether the reforms have contributed to improved feelings of and actual safety for domestic and family violence victim survivors. Fifty per cent of responses agreed with this statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced percentage of children exposed to domestic and family violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is increasing referrals to HRT teams in rural and remote regions, as reported anecdotally through regional consultations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional consultations highlighted that in more rural and regional communities, not only do victims need support, but also their families. It is common that services and help needed for victims is located in another community or region. There are challenges arising when these family members also need financial support for shelter and food.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Outcome 6: Perpetrators stop using violence and are held to account

**Research Question:** To what extent have perpetrators stopped using violence and are they held to account?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**6.1 Perpetrators get the right interventions at the right time**

Proportion of perpetrators who are assessed for perpetrator intervention programs

For perpetrator interventions, justice system initiatives have been implemented to hold perpetrators to account. The number of intervention orders issued by Queensland courts to require perpetrators' attendance of a program or counselling to address their behaviour increased from 616 to 1,088 from 2015 to 2017. Of particular note, the pilot of the Southport Specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court identified promising early outcomes in terms of victim survivors feeling the justice system had held the perpetrator to account.

For government funded perpetrator program responses, there are currently 14 organisations funded by DCSYW to deliver intervention programs in community settings across 29 locations. Evidence suggests the following progress has been made:

- Updated practice standards for perpetrator interventions, and quality framework
- Four-year trial of Walking with Dads
- Expansion of perpetrator programs, including additional community-based programs, and the trial of programs delivered in three correctional centres
- Targeted work of CJGs in developing perpetrator responses for local needs and contexts, with support from CIP (DJAG).

There is an opportunity to ensure that actions to hold perpetrators to account are further enhanced within perpetrator interventions, not just within the justice system.

It is important to further understand whether perpetrators are taking responsibility for their actions, based on understanding the effectiveness of perpetrator programs, and the outcomes they are achieving. Consideration should also be given to understand how this may differ for perpetrators from sub-population groups.

**Better data collection** is required to understand the outcomes of interventions, as well as more research into the drivers of perpetrators' offending behaviour – particularly repeat offending.
### 6.2 Perpetrators participate in programmes and services that enable them to change their violent behaviours and attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of perpetrators who commence behaviour change program or other perpetrator intervention</td>
<td>Results are mixed as to whether there has been an uptake in perpetrators accessing services or whether perpetrators have reduced their use of domestic and family violence as a result of the reforms. In 2017-18, there were 15,184 service users of perpetrator programs, up from 5,970 in 2015-16. However this increase is not reflected in the perspectives of service providers.</td>
<td>The 2017 Annual Highlights Card reports a 92% increase in the number of perpetrators using services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of perpetrators who complete a behaviour change programme or other perpetrator interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of perpetrators that have been assessed by NGOs as having reduced their use of domestic and family violence</td>
<td>While some Annual Highlights Card data (not validated) reported an increased number of perpetrators who NGOs report are reducing their behaviour, this is inconsistent with findings from the Service Provider Survey (n=26).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Perpetrators acknowledge that their use of violence is wrong and harmful to victims and their families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive change in perpetrators' beliefs and attitudes about domestic and family violence</td>
<td>This intermediate outcome is not reported in this review due to limitation of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Services successfully provide perpetrators with opportunities to change and/or improve their family relationships and welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of funded programs completing Accreditation Audits</td>
<td>This intermediate outcome is not reported in this review due to limitation of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of funded programs undertaking audits each year assessed as meeting requirements</td>
<td>This intermediate outcome is not reported in this review due to limitation of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 People working in perpetrator intervention systems are skilled in responding to the dynamics and impacts of domestic and family violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of staff providing perpetrator interventions who meet minimum practice standards* (or other validated standards).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Outcome 7: The justice system deals effectively with domestic and family violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The justice system process for domestic and family violence matters is accessible</td>
<td>Reduced average time (in days) for considering a temporary protection order resulting from an abuse of power</td>
<td>It is too early to tell if access to the justice system has improved. The data currently available does not allow for a conclusion.</td>
<td>As it is too early to ascertain whether several indicators pertaining to this supporting outcome have positively progressed, there is an opportunity to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcomes</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and leads to the provision of a coordinated, consistent and timely response</td>
<td>application, Queensland wide</td>
<td>comprehensive analysis of access to the justice system and if it is improving under the Strategy.</td>
<td>obtain a better understanding once more evidence emerges over time and there is further data availability in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applications finalised within acceptable time standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are some indications that the justice system is responding to meet the needs of victim survivors and perpetrators. Available data points to the improvement in the policing, prosecuting and support systems of domestic and family violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of magistrates receiving professional development on domestic and family violence, as well as percentage of police prosecutors, police officers, duty lawyers and court registry staff receiving training on domestic and family violence and how to respond</td>
<td></td>
<td>In 2017-18, 561 (90%) Magistrate’s court registry staff members had received professional development on domestic and family violence from 793 training sessions, up from 85% of staff members in 2015-16 and 2016-17. In addition there were 37 additional domestic and family violence duty lawyers training in 2017-18 (down from 87 in 2016-17) and 262 solicitors trained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of note, specialist domestic and family violence courts offer one mechanism to deal exclusively with all civil and criminal domestic and family violence matters. The evaluation of the Southport Specialist domestic and family violence Court trial concluded that the original trial had been promising, with results indicating that the needs of victim survivors were more likely to be met at the Southport Specialist Court compared to Ipswich court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In rural and remote areas, it was reported that there was a lack of domestic and family violence expertise and specialties within the regional justice services, which contributed to a lack in accountability of the justice system and perpetrator services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Increased capacity of the justice system to provide comprehensive and integrated services that meet the needs of perpetrators, victims and families</td>
<td>Increased number of victims and perpetrators receiving advice from specialist domestic and family violence duty lawyers</td>
<td>In 2017-18, there were approximately 8,790 aggrieved persons and 10,047 respondents receiving advice from Specialist domestic and family violence duty lawyers. This is an increase from 2,853 aggrieved and 4,347 respondents in 2015-16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased numbers of court locations that are having stakeholder meetings monthly (specialist domestic and family violence courts and courts which have a civil domestic and family violence application list)</td>
<td></td>
<td>As of 2018, there were 32 of the 39 magistrate courts that participated in monthly domestic and family violence stakeholder meetings to some degree, showing their interest and engagement in the issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3. Victims are kept safe leading up to, during and after court</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction of victims with the court process</td>
<td>This intermediate outcome is not reported in this review due to limitation of data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intermediate outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Learnings from the Structured Review of the Second Action Plan</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.4 Perpetrators are more accountable for their actions and demonstrate behaviour change</strong></td>
<td>Increased number of intervention orders made</td>
<td>There were 1,088 intervention orders issued by Queensland courts, an increase from 616 in 2015-16. There is room for further data collection to report on this intermediate outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of intervention orders completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.5 Increased support by CJGs to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perpetrators, victims and families</strong></td>
<td>Increased number of perpetrators, victims and families assisted by the CJG</td>
<td>In 2017-18, there were 1,687 community members who have received support from CJGs for domestic and family violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased understanding of community members of the domestic and family violence process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.6 Increased capability of CJGs to support and respond effectively to domestic and family violence</strong></td>
<td>Increased number of local domestic and family violence awareness initiatives and programs supported</td>
<td>CJGs are leading a range of responses, however, it is too early to tell if these actions have been effective in preventing responding to domestic and family violence. The data shows that there have been a number of actions taken by CJGs to improve capacity in community, resulting in an increase in the amount of services support provided to support victim survivors and perpetrators. This includes (in 2017-18) 32 promotional activities, awareness campaigns or programs that raise awareness of domestic and family violence in the community. No evidence is available as to the impact of these services on these communities as of yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Domestic and Family Violence Coordinators attending domestic and family violence specific professional development/training opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.7 Local justice authority structures appropriately respond to domestic and family violence</strong></td>
<td>Percentage attendance or number of meetings attended by the Domestic and Family Violence Coordinators to local authority model meetings</td>
<td>In 2017-18, there were 132 local authority meetings or other community meetings that discuss domestic and family violence matters in their community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gaps in progress – Future focus**

What are the issues and concerns in the current implementation? What should be the future focus of the Strategy?

Apart from the opportunities that are aligned with each supporting outcome, other future focus of the Strategy to address current gaps has been identified as follows:

- **Focus on meeting the needs of diverse population groups**, including the adoption of a mix of specialised support and building capability among general domestic and family violence services. In regard to actions for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, some evidence suggested it could be useful for DATSIP to be part of the HRT membership, to facilitate information sharing. The flagship evaluation may provide further insights and learnings as to the challenges associated with culturally appropriate responses within HRTs and how these can best be addressed under the Third Action Plan.
- The report identifies six pilots implemented under the Second Action Plan, relative to the early stage of reforms and notes that some government stakeholders have expressed a desire to extend current pilots and trials drawing on their evaluation learnings.
- The focus of actions under foundational element two has been on victim survivors and perpetrators more broadly, and there has been a **limited focus on responding to the unique needs and experiences of diverse population groups**.
- As the Strategy evolves, consideration should also be given to **ensuring a strategic and outcomes-driven approach, rather than compliance focus**. Governance should be focused on strategic leadership and creating buy-in among senior leaders of agencies and facilitating agile implementation approaches, as well as enabling supporting infrastructure (e.g. information sharing).
- Consideration will need to be given regarding **how to leverage local leadership to empower community and business initiatives**. Empowering business and community leaders, including in how to embed place-based approaches, may assist in building community ownership.
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